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CHAPTER - 4
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, description of the problem, survey of related literature, and the research design has been presented. The present chapter has been devoted to the analysis and interpretation of data. No matter how much data and how carefully data is collected in a particular study, it would remain useless, unless it is subjected to careful and thorough analysis. Analysis of data means studying the tabulated material in order to determine inherent factors or meanings. The data is studied to explore the new facts. Analysis requires alert, flexible and open mind and involves breaking down existing complex factors into simple parts and putting the parts together in new arrangement for the purpose of interpretation.

Likewise the purpose of interpretation of data is essentially one, to start with, to show the results. What does the data mean? What does it imply? What is its significance? What is the answer of the original problems - whether it supports or rejects the hypothesis formulated for the study? That is, all the limitations of the data must become a part of interpretation of the results.

Hence interpretation of data is the foremost and essential step of the research work. The main purpose of the interpretation is to reach for broader meaning of desired answer. In fact the raw scores are of no value unless they are
analyzed and interpreted. Without interpreting the data collected through the tools, the investigator can’t achieve the set objectives.

Data collected in a qualitative research study can be subjected to either quantitative or to qualitative analysis. Needless to say that, each of the two approaches i.e. qualitative and quantitative, have its own merits and demerits. A quantitative analysis leads to concrete findings and implications. Findings from a qualitative research are often not as clear-cut. Whichever of the two approaches is used, it should be used carefully.

Keeping in view the objectives of the present study, the data is analyzed and interpreted through various statistical techniques like mean, S.D, ‘t’ value and co-efficient of correlation. The scheme of presentation of data for analysis is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the study of relationships, followed by second section dealing with significance of differences.

Section -1

4.2 Relationships

This part of the study deals with relationship between personal values, teaching attitude and socio-economic status of teacher trainees.
Table 4.2.1
Relationship (Correlation–Coefficient) of Overall Teaching Attitude, Personal Values with Socio-Economic Status of All the Teacher Trainees (N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Teaching Attitude</td>
<td>0.0483 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value (Ka)</td>
<td>0.0801 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value (Kha)</td>
<td>-0.0344 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value (Ga)</td>
<td>-0.0515 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>0.0587 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value (Cha)</td>
<td>0.0334 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value (Chha)</td>
<td>-0.0469 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value (Ja)</td>
<td>-0.0053 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value (Jha)</td>
<td>-0.0660 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value (Ta)</td>
<td>0.0152 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value (Tha)</td>
<td>-0.0537 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS-not significant at 0.05 level

For determining the relationship of overall teaching attitude, personal values with socio-economic status the investigator used Pearson correlation method.

The table 4.2.1 shows that coefficient of correlation between overall teaching attitude and socio-economic status of all the teacher trainees is 0.0483, which is positive, but negligible and not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between overall teaching attitude and socio-economic status of teacher trainees” is retained.
Thus, there is no significant relationship between overall teaching attitude and socio-economic status of teacher trainees. Hence socio-economic status is not one of the reasons in developing teaching attitude of teacher trainees. Table 4.2.1 also reveals that the coefficient of correlation of personal values with socio-economic status is negligible.

**Religious Value**

It is clear from the table 4.2.1 that there is positive correlation of 0.0801 between religious value and socio-economic status, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

**Social Value**

It is apparent from the table 4.2.1 that there is negative correlation of -0.0344 between social value and socio-economic status, which is negligible and not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

**Democratic Value**

It is apparent from the table 4.2.1 that there is negative correlation of -0.0515 between democratic value and socio-economic status, which is negligible and not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

**Aesthetic Value**

It is evident from the table 4.2.1 that there is positive correlation of 0.0587 between aesthetic value and socio-economic status, which is negligible and not significant at 0.05 level of significance.
Economic Value

The table 4.2.1 reveals that there is positive correlation of 0.0334, between economic value and socio-economic status, which is negligible and not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus economic value is not affected by the socio-economic status.

Knowledge Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.1 that there is negative correlation of -0.0469 between knowledge value and socio-economic status, which is negligible and not significant, at 0.05 level of significance.

Hedonistic Value

The table 4.2.1 reveals that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0053 between hedonistic value and socio-economic status, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Power Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.1 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0660, between power value and socio-economic status, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, power value is not affected by the socio-economic status.

Family Prestige Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.1 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0152 between family prestige value and socio-economic status, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus family prestige value is not affected by the socio-economic status.
Health Value

The table 4.2.1 reveals that there is negative and negligible correlation of -.0537 between health value and socio-economic status, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus health value is not affected by the socio-economic status.

Hence, from the above analysis, it is clear that there is positive and negligible correlation between socio-economic status and the personal values like religious, aesthetic, economic, family prestige, where as there is a negative and negligible correlation between socio-economic status and the personal values like social, democratic, knowledge, power, hedonistic and health. But no significant relationship has been found between socio-economic status and all the personal values. Thus, the hypothesis “there is no significant relationship between personal values and socio economic status” is retained.
Table 4.2.2

Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) of Personal Values
With Teaching Attitude
(N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Teaching Profession</th>
<th>Classroom Teaching</th>
<th>Child-Centered Practices</th>
<th>Educational Process</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value</td>
<td>0.0575 NS</td>
<td>0.0122 NS</td>
<td>-0.0088NS</td>
<td>-0.0542 NS</td>
<td>-0.037NS</td>
<td>-0.0188NS</td>
<td>-0.0371NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value</td>
<td>0.1114**</td>
<td>0.0325NS</td>
<td>0.0369NS</td>
<td>0.1068**</td>
<td>0.0646NS</td>
<td>0.0755NS</td>
<td>0.0915*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value</td>
<td>0.1890**</td>
<td>0.0746NS</td>
<td>0.0680NS</td>
<td>0.1852**</td>
<td>0.1367**</td>
<td>0.1517**</td>
<td>0.1729**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value</td>
<td>-0.0389NS</td>
<td>0.0323NS</td>
<td>-0.0067NS</td>
<td>-0.0314NS</td>
<td>-0.0011NS</td>
<td>0.0031NS</td>
<td>-0.0091NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value</td>
<td>-0.0282NS</td>
<td>-0.0435NS</td>
<td>-0.0661NS</td>
<td>-0.0362NS</td>
<td>-0.0734NS</td>
<td>-0.0785NS</td>
<td>-0.0713NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value</td>
<td>0.0694NS</td>
<td>0.0312NS</td>
<td>0.0607NS</td>
<td>0.0713NS</td>
<td>0.0876*</td>
<td>0.0629NS</td>
<td>0.0843*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value</td>
<td>0.0756NS</td>
<td>-0.1161**</td>
<td>-0.0581NS</td>
<td>-0.0791NS</td>
<td>-0.0663NS</td>
<td>-0.0978*</td>
<td>-0.1025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value</td>
<td>0.1639**</td>
<td>0.0749NS</td>
<td>0.0401NS</td>
<td>0.1576**</td>
<td>0.1389**</td>
<td>0.1353**</td>
<td>0.1533**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige</td>
<td>0.3863**</td>
<td>0.3366**</td>
<td>-0.0475NS</td>
<td>0.1401**</td>
<td>-0.0729NS</td>
<td>-0.0922*</td>
<td>-0.1209**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value</td>
<td>0.1510**</td>
<td>-0.1800**</td>
<td>-0.0683NS</td>
<td>-0.1978**</td>
<td>-0.2098**</td>
<td>-0.2097**</td>
<td>-0.2144**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level.
*   Significant at 0.05 level.
**  Significant at 0.01 level

Religious Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.2 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0371 between religious value and overall teaching attitude,
which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, overall teaching attitude has no significant relationship with religious value.

Social Value
The table 4.2.2 shows that there is positive correlation of 0.0915 between social value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.05 level. It means, the teachers who exhibit social qualities are found to have favourable teaching attitude towards teaching.

Democratic Value
It is evident from the table 4.2.2 that there is positive correlation of 0.1729 between democratic value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.01 level. It means the teacher trainees, who exhibit democratic attitude are found to have favourable teaching attitude towards teaching.

Aesthetic Value
It is apparent from the table 4.2.2 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0091 between aesthetic value and overall teaching attitude, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Thus overall teaching attitude shows no relationship with aesthetic value.

Economic Value
It is apparent from the table 4.2.2 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0713 between economic value and overall teaching attitude, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, overall teaching attitude shows no relationship with economic value.
Knowledge Value

It is obvious from the table 4.2.2 that there is positive correlation of 0.0843 between knowledge value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.05 level. It means that the teacher trainees who try to find out new facts and relationships and aspires to be known as the seeker of knowledge are found to have favourable teaching attitude towards teaching.

Hedonistic Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.2 that there is negative correlation of -0.1025 between hedonistic value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus, the teacher trainees with high hedonistic value possess less favourable teaching attitude.

Power Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.2 that there is positive correlation of 0.1533 between power value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means that the teacher trainees who exhibit power value are found to have favourable teaching attitude towards teaching. They prefer a job where they get opportunity to exercise authority over others.

Family Prestige Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.2 that there is negative correlation of -0.1209, between family prestige value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.01 level. It means that the teacher trainees who exhibit family prestige value are found to have less favourable teaching attitude towards teaching.
Health Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.2 that there is negative correlation of -0.2144 between health value and overall teaching attitude, which is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, the teacher trainees who are conscious about their health possess less favourable teaching attitude.

Hence, from the above analysis, it can be concluded that there is negative correlation between the total teaching attitude and the personal values like religious, aesthetic, economic, hedonistic, family prestige and health. There is a positive correlation between teaching attitude and the personal values like social, democratic, knowledge and power. Therefore the hypothesis “there is no significant relationship between personal values and teaching attitude” is rejected with respect to social, democratic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige, health values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=93</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=386</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value(Ka)</td>
<td>0.0641 NS</td>
<td>0.0049 NS</td>
<td>0.0823 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value(Kha)</td>
<td>0.0569 NS</td>
<td>0.0106 NS</td>
<td>-0.0177 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value(Ga)</td>
<td>-0.0801 NS</td>
<td>0.0074 NS</td>
<td>-0.0594 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value(Gha)</td>
<td>0.0409 NS</td>
<td>0.0094 NS</td>
<td>-0.0096 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value(Cha)</td>
<td>0.0603 NS</td>
<td>-0.0497 NS</td>
<td>0.0593 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value(Chha)</td>
<td>0.0095 NS</td>
<td>0.0043 NS</td>
<td>-0.0823 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value(Ja)</td>
<td>-0.11978**</td>
<td>0.0028 NS</td>
<td>0.0121 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value(Jha)</td>
<td>-0.18822**</td>
<td>-0.0996*</td>
<td>0.0695 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value(Ta)</td>
<td>-0.0630 NS</td>
<td>0.0731 NS</td>
<td>-0.0615 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value(Tha)</td>
<td>0.0918*</td>
<td>-0.009 NS</td>
<td>-0.0073 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SES- Socio-Economic Status**

**NS- Not Significant at 0.05 level**

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Significant at 0.01 level

For determining the relationship between personal values and three levels of socio-economic status, the investigator has grouped the sample into three levels or groups-
Group 1 - Low socio-economic status
Group 2 - Average socio-economic status
Group 3 - High socio-economic status

Religious Value
It is evident from the above table (Table 4.2.3) that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0641, 0.0049, and 0.0823 between religious value and group 1, 2 and 3 respectively. All the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, socio-economic status shows no relationship with religious value.

Social Value
It is clear from the table 4.2.3 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0569 between social value and group 1. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0106 between social value and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0177 between social value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, socio-economic status shows no relationship with social value.

Democratic Value
It is apparent from the above table 4.2.3 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0801 between democratic value and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0594 between democratic value and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0074, between democratic value and
group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, socio-economic status has no relationship with democratic value.

Aesthetic Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.3 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0409 between aesthetic value and group 1. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0094 between aesthetic value and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0096 between aesthetic value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, socio-economic status shows no relationship with aesthetic value.

Economic Value

It is apparent from the above table 4.2.3 that there is positive correlation of 0.0603 between economic value and group 1. There is positive correlation of 0.0593 between economic value and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. There is negative correlation of -0.0497 between economic value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, socio-economic status shows no relationship with aesthetic value.

Knowledge Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.3 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0095 between knowledge value and group 1. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0043 between knowledge value and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0823 between knowledge value and group 3,
which is, not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, socio-economic status shows no relationship with knowledge value.

**Hedonistic Value**

The table 4.2.3 reveals that coefficient of correlation is positive and negligible between hedonistic value and, group 2 with the value 0.0028. Coefficient of correlation is positive and negligible between hedonistic value and group 3 with the values 0.0121. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The coefficient of correlation is negative between hedonistic value and group 1, and it is -0.1197, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, the teacher trainees of low socio-economic status have less hedonistic value.

**Power Value**

It is apparent from the above table 4.2.3 that there is negative correlation of -0.18822 between power value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0996 between power value and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0695 between power value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, teacher trainees of group 3 show more desirability of ruling over others and also of leading others. The teacher trainees of group 1 and 2 show less desirability of ruling over others and also of leading others.

**Family Prestige Value**

It is clear from the above table 4.2.3 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0630 between family prestige value and group 1. There is
negative and negligible correlation of -0.0615 between family prestige value and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0731 between family prestige value and group 2, which is, not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means socio-economic status does not show any relationship with the behaviour, roles and functions which the teacher trainees perform in the family.

Health Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.3 that there is negative and negligible correlation of 0.0098 between health value and group 2. There is negative and negligible correlation of 0.0073 between health value and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is significant, positive correlation of 0.0918 between health value and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level.

Therefore, from the above analysis, it can be concluded that the coefficient of correlation between hedonistic, power value and all the teacher trainees of low socio economic status is significant and negative while the coefficient of correlation between health value and the teacher trainees of low socio economic status is significant and positive. Power value is negatively correlated with teacher trainees of average socio-economic group but no significant relationship exists between personal values and teacher trainees of high socio-economic group.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the low socio-economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with
respect to hedonistic, power and health values.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the average socio-economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to power value.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the high socio-economic status of teacher trainees is retained.

**Table 4.2.4**

**Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Personal Values and Three Levels of Socio-Economic Status of B.Ed. Teacher Trainees.**

(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=44</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=202</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES =54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value(Ka)</td>
<td>-0.133*</td>
<td>0.0220NS</td>
<td>-0.1125NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value(Kha)</td>
<td>0.153**</td>
<td>0.0183NS</td>
<td>0.1461*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value(Ga)</td>
<td>0.009NS</td>
<td>-0.0050NS</td>
<td>0.01532**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value(Gha)</td>
<td>-0.054NS</td>
<td>0.0035NS</td>
<td>-0.1162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value(Cha)</td>
<td>-0.0068NS</td>
<td>-0.0771NS</td>
<td>0.108NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value(Chha)</td>
<td>0.1367*</td>
<td>0.0158NS</td>
<td>0.0146NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value(Ja)</td>
<td>-0.136*</td>
<td>0.0286NS</td>
<td>0.1077NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value(Jha)</td>
<td>-0.090NS</td>
<td>-0.178**</td>
<td>0.1263*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value(Ta)</td>
<td>-0.0915NS</td>
<td>0.0929NS</td>
<td>-0.0742NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value(Tha)</td>
<td>0.1745**</td>
<td>0.0030NS</td>
<td>-0.1804**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level  
* Significant at 0.05 level  
** Significant at 0.01 level
For determining the relationship between personal values and three levels of socio-economic status, the investigator has grouped the B.Ed. teacher trainees into three levels or groups-

- Group 1 - Low socio-economic status
- Group 2 - Average socio-economic status
- Group 3 - High socio-economic status

**Religious Value**

It is apparent from table 4.2.4 that there is negative correlation of -0.133 between religious value and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Similarly there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.1125 between religious value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.022 between religious value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant negative correlation, exists between religious value and the teacher trainees of group 1, while no significant relationship exists between religious value and rest of the two groups i.e group 2 and group 3. Hence, teacher trainees of low socio-economic status possess less religious value.

**Social Value**

It is clear from the table 4.2.4 that there is positive correlation of 0.153 between social value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1461 between social value and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. At the same time, there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0183 between social value and...
group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between social value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 3 while no significant relationship exists between social value and group 2. Hence, the teacher trainees of low and high socio-economic status possess high social value.

Democratic Value
The table 4.2.4 shows that there is positive correlation of 0.009 between democratic value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.01532 between democratic value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0050 between democratic value and group 2, which is, not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant positive correlation exists between democratic value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant relationship exists between democratic value and group 1 and group 2. It means democratic value is high in teacher trainees of high socio-economic group.

Aesthetic Value
It is obvious from the table 4.2.4 that there is negative correlation of -0.054 between aesthetic value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1162 between aesthetic value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0035, between aesthetic value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, significant negative correlation exists between aesthetic value and the teacher trainees
of group 3, while no significant relationship exists between aesthetic value and group 1 and group 2.

**Economic Value**

It is clear from the table 4.2.4 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0068 between economic value and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0771 between economic value and group 2, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Also there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.1087 between economic value and group 3 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation exists between economic value and the teacher trainees of all the three groups.

**Knowledge Value**

It is evident from the table 4.2.4 that there is positive correlation of 0.1367 between knowledge value and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0158 between knowledge value and group 2. There is positive correlation of 0.0146 between knowledge value and group 3. Both these values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence significant correlation exists between knowledge value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and no significant correlation exists between knowledge value and the teacher trainees group 2 and group 3. Therefore, knowledge value is high in teacher trainees of low socio-economic status.
Hedonistic Value
It is clear from the table 4.2.4 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0286 between hedonistic value and group 2. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.1077 between hedonistic value and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.136, between hedonistic value and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant correlation exists between hedonistic value and the teacher trainees of group 1, while no significant correlation exists between hedonistic value and the teacher trainees of group 2 and group 3.

Power Value
It is obvious from the table 4.2.4 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.090 between power value and group 1. There is negative correlation of -0.178 between power value and group 2, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive and significant correlation of 0.1263 between power value and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between power value and the teacher trainees of group 3. Thus, teacher trainees of high socio-economic status exercise high power value.

Family Prestige Value
It is evident from the table 4.2.4 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0915 between family prestige value and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0742 between family prestige value and group 3. Both these values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance.
There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0929 between family prestige value and group 2, which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation exists between family prestige value and all the three levels of socio-economic status.

Health Value

The table 4.2.4 shows that there is positive correlation of 0.1745, between health value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level. There is positive correlation of 0.0030 between health value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1804 between health value and group 3 which is significant 0.01 level of significance. It is concluded that significant positive correlation exists between health value and the teacher trainees of group 1. Significant negative correlation exists between health value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant relationship exists between health value and group 2. Hence, teacher trainees of low socio-economic status are more conscious about their health.

From the table it is concluded that there exists significant negative correlation between

a) religious and hedonistic value and B.Ed. teacher trainees of low socio-economic status.

b) power value and teacher trainees of average socio-economic status.

c) aesthetic, health value and teacher trainees of high socio-economic status.
Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between

a) social, knowledge, health values and teacher trainees of low socio-economic status.

b) social, democratic, power value teacher trainees of high socio-economic status respectively.

No significant positive correlation exists between all the personal value and the average socio economic status of teacher trainees.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the low socio economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to religious, social, knowledge hedonistic and health values.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the average socio economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to power value.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the high socio economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to social, democratic, aesthetic, power, and health values.
Table 4.2.5

Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Personal Values and Three Levels of Socio-Economic Status of DIET Teacher Trainees

(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=49</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=184</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value (Ka)</td>
<td>0.2086**</td>
<td>-0.0078NS</td>
<td>0.1290*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value (Kha)</td>
<td>-0.0182NS</td>
<td>-0.0119NS</td>
<td>-0.0317NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value (Ga)</td>
<td>-0.1603**</td>
<td>0.0045NS</td>
<td>-0.0405NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>0.1622**</td>
<td>0.0198NS</td>
<td>0.0926NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value (Cha)</td>
<td>0.1576**</td>
<td>-0.0094NS</td>
<td>0.0750NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value (Chha)</td>
<td>-0.1120NS</td>
<td>-0.0340NS</td>
<td>-0.0214NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value (Ja)</td>
<td>-0.1257*</td>
<td>-0.0151NS</td>
<td>-0.2209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value (Jha)</td>
<td>-0.2812**</td>
<td>0.0401NS</td>
<td>0.1765**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value (Ta)</td>
<td>-0.0702NS</td>
<td>0.0813NS</td>
<td>-0.2132**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value (Tha)</td>
<td>0.0256NS</td>
<td>-0.0037NS</td>
<td>-0.1071NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level
*  Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

For determining the relationship between personal values and three levels of socio-economic status, the investigator has grouped the DIET teacher trainees into three levels or groups-

- Group 1 - Low socio-economic status
- Group 2 - Average socio-economic status
- Group 3 - High socio-economic status
Religious Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.5 that there is positive correlation of 0.2086, between religious value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1290 between religious value and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0078 between religious value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between religious value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 3, while no significant relationship exists between religious value and group 2. It means teacher trainees of low and high socio-economic status are more religious.

Social Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.5 that there is negative and negligible correlation between social value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are -0.0182, -0.0119 and -0.0317 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, significant correlation exists between social value and the teacher trainees of all the three groups.

Democratic Value

The table 4.2.5 shows that there is negative correlation of -0.1603 between democratic value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0405 between democratic value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0045 between democratic value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that
significant negative correlation exists between democratic value and the
teacher trainees of group 1, while no significant relationship exists between
democratic value and rest of the two groups i.e group 2 and group 3. It means
democratic value is low in teacher trainees of low socio-economic status.

Aesthetic Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.5 that there is positive correlation between
aesthetic value and all the three groups. The values are 0.1622, 0.0198, and
0.0926 respectively. Out of these values only value of group 1 is significant at
0.01 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation exists
between aesthetic value and the teacher trainees of group 1. It means
aesthetic value is high in teacher trainees of low socio-economic status.

Economic Value

It is obvious from the table 4.2.5 that there is positive correlation of 0.1576
between economic value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of
significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0750, between economic value
and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is
negative and negligible correlation of -0.0094 between economic value and
group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore,
significant positive correlation exists between economic value and the teacher
trainees of group 1 while no significant relationship exists between economic
value and group 2 and group 3. It means economic value is high in teacher
trainees of low socio-economic status.
Knowledge Value

The table 4.2.5 reveals that there is negative and negligible correlation between knowledge value and all the three groups. The values are -0.1120, -0.0340 and -0.0214 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore concluded that no significant correlation exists between knowledge value and the teacher trainees of all the three groups.

Hedonistic Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.5 that there is negative correlation between hedonistic value and all the three groups. The values are -0.1257, -0.0151 and -0.2209 respectively, out of which the value of group 1 and group 3 are significant at 0.05 level of significance, while the value of group 2 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, significant negative correlation exists between hedonistic value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 3. It means teacher trainees of low and high socio-economic status have less hedonistic value.

Power Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.5 that there is negative correlation of -0.2812 between power value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0401 between power value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is significant positive correlation of 0.1765 between power value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, significant negative correlation exists between power value and group 1 while significant positive correlation exists between power value and group 3.
Family Prestige Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.5 that there is negative correlation of -0.0702 between family prestige value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.2132 between family prestige value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0813 between family prestige value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant negative correlation exists between family prestige value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant relationship exists between family prestige value and rest of the two groups i.e group 1 and group 2.

Health Value

The table 4.2.5 shows that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0037 between health value and group 2. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.1071 between health value and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0256 between health value and group 1, which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation exists between health value and the teacher trainees of all the groups. The table clearly indicate –

Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between

a) religious, aesthetic, economic values and low socio-economic status of DIET teacher trainees.
b) religious, power values and high socio economic status of DIET teacher trainees.

No significant relationship exists between personal values and average socio-economic status of DIET teacher trainees.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and negative between

a) democratic, hedonistic, power values and the low socio economic status of teacher trainees.

b) hedonistic, family prestige values and high socio-economic status of DIET teacher trainees.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the low socio economic status of DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to religious, democratic, aesthetic, economic, hedonistic and power values.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the average socio-economic status of DIET teacher trainees is retained.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the high socio-economic status of DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to religious, hedonistic, power and family prestige value.
Table 4.2.6

Relationships (Correlation Coefficient) Between Personal Values and Three Levels of Socio-Economic Status of Male Teacher Trainees (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=54</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=198</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value(Ka)</td>
<td>-0.0198 NS</td>
<td>-0.0262 NS</td>
<td>-0.0667 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value(Kha)</td>
<td>0.1695**</td>
<td>-0.0033 NS</td>
<td>0.1501**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value(Ga)</td>
<td>0.036 NS</td>
<td>-0.0290 NS</td>
<td>0.1238*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value(Gha)</td>
<td>-0.0103 NS</td>
<td>0.0942 NS</td>
<td>-0.1019 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value(Cha)</td>
<td>-0.0021 NS</td>
<td>-0.0831 NS</td>
<td>0.2447**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value(Chha)</td>
<td>-0.050 NS</td>
<td>0.0348 NS</td>
<td>0.1370*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value(Ja)</td>
<td>-0.1238*</td>
<td>-0.0454 NS</td>
<td>-0.0450 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value(Jha)</td>
<td>-0.1615**</td>
<td>-0.1828**</td>
<td>0.2324**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value(Ta)</td>
<td>-0.0372 NS</td>
<td>0.1093 NS</td>
<td>-0.3270**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value(Tha)</td>
<td>0.0517 NS</td>
<td>0.0508 NS</td>
<td>-0.1461*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SES  Socio-Economic Status
NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level.
*  Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

For determining the relationship between personal values and three levels of socio-economic status, the investigator has grouped the male teacher trainees into three levels or groups-

Group 1 - Low socio-economic status
Group 2 - Average socio-economic status
Group 3 - High socio-economic status
Religious Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.6 that there is negative and negligible correlation between religious value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are -0.0198, -0.0262 and -0.0667 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation exists between religious value and the teacher trainees of all the three groups.

Social Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.6 that there is positive correlation of 0.1695 between social value and group 1. There is positive correlation of 0.1501 between social value and group 3. Both these values are significant at 0.01 level. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0033 between social value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between social value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 3, while no significant relationship exists between social value and group 2.

Democratic Value

The table 4.2.6 shows that there is positive correlation of 0.036 between democratic value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1238 between democratic value and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0290 between democratic value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between democratic value and the teacher trainees of group
3. While no significant relationship exists between democratic value and group 1 and group 2.

**Aesthetic Value**

It is evident from the table 4.2.6 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0103 between aesthetic value and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.1019 between aesthetic value and group 3. Both these values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0942 between aesthetic value and group 2, which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, no significant positive correlation exists between aesthetic value and the teacher trainees of group 2 and at the same time no significant negative correlation exists between aesthetic value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 3.

**Economic Value**

The table 4.2.6 reveals that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0021 between economic value and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0831 between economic value and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.2447 between economic value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between economic value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant correlation exists between economic value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 2. Therefore, economic value are high in male teacher trainees of high socio-economic group.
Knowledge Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.6 that there is positive correlation of 0.0348 between knowledge value and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1370 between knowledge value and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.050 between knowledge value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation exists between knowledge value and the teacher trainees of group 3 while no significant relationship exists between knowledge value and group 1 and group 2.

Hedonistic Value

It is obvious from the table 4.2.6 that there is negative correlation between hedonistic value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are -0.1238, -0.0454 and -0.0450 respectively. Out of these, the value of group 1 are significant at 0.05 level of significance, while the values of the rest two groups are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant negative correlation exists between hedonistic value and the teacher trainees of group 1, while no significant correlation exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 2 and group 3.

Power Value

It is apparent from the table 4.2.6 that there is negative correlation of -0.1615 between power value and group 1. There is negative correlation of -0.1828 between power value and group 2. Both the values are significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.2324
between power value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant positive correlation exists between power value and the teacher trainees of group 3. Also there is negative correlation exists between power value and the teacher trainees of group 1 and group 2.

Family Prestige Value

It is obvious from the table 4.2.6 that there is negative correlation of -0.0372 between family prestige value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance There is negative correlation of -0.3270 between family prestige value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.1093, between family prestige value and group 2, which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant negative correlation exists between family prestige value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant relationship exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 1 and group 2.

Health Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.6 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0517 between health value and group 1. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0508 between health value and group 2 Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.146 between health value and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between health value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant relationship exists between health value and group 1and group 2.
Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between

a) social value and low socio-economic status of male teacher trainees

b) social, democratic, economic, knowledge, power values and high socio-economic status of male teacher trainees.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and negative between

a) hedonistic, power values and low socio-economic status of male teacher trainees.

b) power value and average socio economic status of male teacher trainees.

c) family prestige value and high socio economic status of male teacher trainees.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the low socio economic status of male teacher trainees is rejected with respect to social, hedonistic and power values.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the average socio economic status of male teacher trainees is rejected with respect to power value.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the high socio economic status of male teacher trainees is rejected with respect to social, democratic, economic, knowledge, power, family prestige and health values.
### Table 4.2.7

**Relationships (Correlation Coefficient) Between Personal Values and Three Levels Of Socio-Economic Status of Female Teacher Trainees (N=300)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=41</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=191</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value(Ka)</td>
<td>-0.0452 NS</td>
<td>-0.0652 NS</td>
<td>0.0918 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value(Kha)</td>
<td>0.0604 NS</td>
<td>0.0386 NS</td>
<td>0.0452 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value(Ga)</td>
<td>0.1046 NS</td>
<td>0.0840 NS</td>
<td>-0.1805**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value(Gha)</td>
<td>-0.067 NS</td>
<td>-0.1063 NS</td>
<td>-0.1150*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value(Cha)</td>
<td>0.1966**</td>
<td>-0.1145*</td>
<td>0.0828 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value(Chha)</td>
<td>0.1856**</td>
<td>0.0317 NS</td>
<td>-0.058 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value(Ja)</td>
<td>-0.0965 NS</td>
<td>0.1088 NS</td>
<td>0.0121 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value(Jha)</td>
<td>-0.1249*</td>
<td>-0.0231 NS</td>
<td>-0.0523 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value(Ta)</td>
<td>-0.0903 NS</td>
<td>0.1322*</td>
<td>0.0787 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value(Tha)</td>
<td>0.2207**</td>
<td>0.0162 NS</td>
<td>0.1626*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SES**  Socio-Economic Status  
**NS**  Not Significant at 0.05 level  
* Significant at 0.05 level  
** Significant at 0.01 level

For determining the relationship between personal values and three levels of socio-economic status of female teacher trainees, the investigator has grouped the female teacher trainees into three groups:

- **Group 1** - Low socio-economic status
- **Group 2** - Average socio-economic status
- **Group 3** - High socio-economic status
Religious Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0452 between religious value and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0652 between religious value and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0918, between religious value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation exists between religious value and the teacher trainees of all the groups.

Social Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.7 that there is positive and negligible correlation between social value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are 0.0604, 0.0386 and 0.0452 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, no significant correlation exists between social value and the teacher trainees of all the groups.

Democratic Value

It is obvious from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative correlation of -0.1046 between democratic value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1805 between democratic value and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0840 between democratic value and group 2, which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant negative correlation exists between democratic value and the teacher trainees of group 3.
Aesthetic Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative correlation between aesthetic value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are -0.067, -0.1063 and -0.1150 respectively. Out of which only the value of group 3 is significant at 0.05 level while the two i.e values of group 1 and group 2 are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant negative correlation exists between aesthetic value and the teacher trainees of group 3, while no significant relationship exists between aesthetic value and group 1, and group 2.

Economic Value

The table 4.2.7 shows that there is negative correlation of -0.1145 between economic value and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level. There is positive correlation of 0.1966 between economic value and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0828 between economic value and group 3 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between economic value and the teacher trainees of group 1. Significant negative correlation exists between economic value and the teacher trainees of group 2, while no significant relationship exists between economic value and group 3.

Knowledge Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.058 between knowledge value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1856 between
knowledge value and group 1 which, is significant at 0.01 level of significance.
There is positive correlation of 0.0317 between knowledge value and group 2,
which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it is concluded
that significant positive correlation exists between knowledge value and the
teacher trainees of group 1.

Hedonistic Value
It is obvious from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative and negligible
correlation of -0.965, between hedonistic value and group 1, which is not
significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible
correlation of 0.1088, between hedonistic value and group 2. There is positive
and negligible correlation of 0.0121, between hedonistic value and group 2
which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is concluded that no
significant correlation exists between hedonistic value and all the teacher
trainees.

Power Value
It is clear from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative correlation between power
value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are -0.1249,
-0.0231 and -0.0523 respectively. Out of which only the value of group 1 is
significant at 0.05 level while the rest of the two i.e values of group 2 and
group 3 are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore,
concluded that significant negative correlation exists between power value
and the teacher trainees of group 1 while no significant relationship exists
between power value and group 2 and group 3.
Family Prestige Value

It is evident from the table 4.2.7 that there is negative correlation of -0.0903 between family prestige value and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1322 between family prestige value and group 2 which, is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0787 between family prestige value and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation exists between family prestige value and the teacher trainees of group 2.

Health Value

It is clear from the table 4.2.7 that there is positive correlation between health value and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are 0.2207, 0.0162, and 0.1626 respectively. Out of which the value of group 1 is significant at 0.01 level of significance while the value of group 3 is significant at 0.05 level. But the value of group 2 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is concluded that significant correlation exists between health value and the group 1 and group 3 of teacher trainees.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between

a) economic, knowledge, health values and low socio-economic status of female teacher trainees

b) family prestige and average socio economic status of teacher trainees

c) health value and high socio-economic status of female teacher trainees.
Coefficient of correlation is significant and negative between:

a) power value and low socio-economic status of female teacher trainees.

b) economic value and average socio-economic status of female teacher trainees.

c) democratic, aesthetic values and high socio-economic status of female teacher trainees.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the low socio-economic status of female teacher trainees is rejected with respect to economic, knowledge, power health values.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the average socio-economic status of female teacher trainees is rejected with respect to economic and family prestige value.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between personal values and the high socio-economic status of female teacher trainees is rejected with respect to democratic, aesthetic and health value.
### Table 4.2.8

Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Teaching Attitude and Socio-Economic Status of All Teacher Trainees.

*(N=600)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=93</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=386</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession</td>
<td>-0.0874*</td>
<td>0.0509 NS</td>
<td>0.0645 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>-0.1075*</td>
<td>0.0117 NS</td>
<td>0.0841*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices</td>
<td>-0.0846*</td>
<td>0.0896*</td>
<td>-0.0265 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process</td>
<td>-0.1180**</td>
<td>0.1040*</td>
<td>-0.0251 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>-0.0250 NS</td>
<td>0.0860*</td>
<td>-0.023 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.1189**</td>
<td>0.0716 NS</td>
<td>-0.0524 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Attitude</td>
<td>-0.1129**</td>
<td>0.0982*</td>
<td>0.0002 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SES** Socio-Economic Status  
**NS** Not Significant at 0.05 level  
* Significant at 0.05 level  
** Significant at 0.01 level

For determining the relationship between teaching attitude and three levels of socio-economic status of teacher trainees, the investigator has grouped the sample into three groups -

- Group 1 - Low socio-economic status  
- Group 2 - Average socio-economic status  
- Group 3 - High socio-economic status

**Teaching Profession**

It is clear from the table 4.2.8 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0509 between teaching profession and group 2. There is positive and
negligible correlation of 0.0645 between teaching profession and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0874 between teaching profession and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant negative correlation is found between teaching profession and group 1.

**Classroom Teaching**

It is evident from the table 4.2.8 that there is positive correlation of 0.0117 between classroom teaching and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0841 between classroom teaching and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1075 between classroom teaching and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between classroom teaching and group 3 and significant negative correlation is found between classroom teaching and group 1. Thus, teacher trainees of high socio-economic status possess favourable attitude towards classroom teaching.

**Child-Centred Practices**

It is apparent from the table 4.2.8 that there is positive correlation of 0.0896, between child-centered practices and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0846 between child-centered practices and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0265 between Child-Centered Practices and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.
Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between child-centred practices and group 2 and significant negative correlation is found between child-centred practices and group 1.

Educational Process

It is obvious from the table 4.2.8 that there is positive Correlation of 0.1040, between educational process and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of 0.1180 between educational process and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0251 between educational process and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant positive correlation is found between educational process and group 2, and significant negative correlation is found between educational process and group 1.

Pupils

It is evident from the table 4.2.8 that there is positive correlation of 0.0860, between pupils and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0250 between pupils and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.023 between pupils and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between pupils and group 2, while no significant correlation is found with the rest of the two groups. Thus, teacher trainees of average socio-economic status are found to possess favourable attitude towards pupils.
Teachers

The table 4.2.8 reveals that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0716 between teachers and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1189 between attitude towards teachers and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0524 between attitude towards teachers and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, significant negative correlation is found between attitude towards teachers and group 1.

Overall Attitude

It is clear from the table 4.2.8 that there is positive correlation of 0.0982 between overall attitude and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0002 between overall attitude and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1129 between overall attitude and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation is found between overall teaching attitude and group 2. and significant negative correlation is found between overall teaching attitude and group 1.

Thus, the coefficient of correlation is found to be significant and negative between

a) attitude towards teaching profession, classroom teaching, and child centered practices, educational process, teachers, overall attitude and low socio economic status of all the teacher trainees.
Significant positive correlation is found between:

a) attitude towards child centered practices, educational process, pupils, overall attitude and average socio economic status of all the teacher trainees.

b) attitude towards classroom teaching and high socio economic status of all the teacher trainees.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the low socio economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards teaching profession, classroom teaching, child centered practices, educational process, teachers, and overall attitude.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the average socio economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards child centered practices, educational process, pupils and overall attitude.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the average socio economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards classroom teaching.)
Table 4.2.9
Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Teaching Attitude and Socio-Economic Status of B.Ed. Teacher Trainees
(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=44</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=202</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession</td>
<td>-0.1714**</td>
<td>0.0423 NS</td>
<td>0.0874 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>-0.2367**</td>
<td>-0.0866 NS</td>
<td>0.1075 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Centered Practices</td>
<td>0.0179 NS</td>
<td>0.0712 NS</td>
<td>-0.0765 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process</td>
<td>0.0062 NS</td>
<td>0.0621 NS</td>
<td>0.0927 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>0.1353*</td>
<td>0.0407 NS</td>
<td>0.0321 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0.0317 NS</td>
<td>-0.0045 NS</td>
<td>0.0579 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Attitude</td>
<td>-0.0192NS</td>
<td>0.0361 NS</td>
<td>0.0663 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SES**  Socio-Economic Status  
**NS**  Not Significant at 0.05 level  
*  Significant at 0.05 level  
**  Significant at 0.01 level  

For determining the relationship between teaching attitude and three levels of socio-economic status of teacher trainees, the investigator has grouped the B.Ed. teacher trainees into three groups-

Group 1-Low socio-economic status  
Group 2-Average socio-economic status  
Group 3-High socio-economic status
Teaching Profession

It is clear from the table 4.2.9 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0423 between teaching profession and group 2. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0874 between teaching profession and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1714 between teaching profession and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that significant negative correlation is found between teaching profession and group 1.

Classroom Teaching

It is evident from the table 4.2.9 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.1075, between classroom teaching and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.2367 between classroom teaching and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0866 between classroom teaching and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant negative correlation is found between classroom teaching and group 1.

Child Centered Practices

It is clear from the table 4.2.9 that there is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0765 between child-centered practices and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0179 between child-centred practices and group 1. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0712 between child-centered practices and group 1.
and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, concluded that no significant correlation is found between child-centred practices and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. of teacher trainees.

Educational Process

Table 4.2.9 reveals that there is positive and negligible correlation between educational process and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are 0.0062, 0.0621 and 0.0927 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance Therefore, it is concluded that no significant correlation is found between educational process and all the groups.

Pupils

It is obvious from the table 4.2.9 that there is positive correlation between pupils and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are 0.1353, 0.0407 and 0.0321 respectively. Out of which the value of group 1 is significant at 0.05 level of significance while the rest of the two i.e values of group 2 and group 3 are not significant at 0.05 level of significance Therefore, it is concluded that significant correlation is found between pupils and group 1.

Teachers

It is apparent from the table 4.2.9 that there is positive correlation of 0.0317 between attitude towards teachers and group 1. There is positive correlation of 0.0579 between teachers attitude and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0045 between attitude towards teachers and group 2, which
is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, no significant correlation is found between attitudes towards teachers with all the groups.

**Overall Teaching Attitude**

The table 4.2.9 shows that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0361 between overall teaching attitude and group 2. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0663 between overall teaching attitude and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0192 between overall teaching attitude and group 1, which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation is found in overall teaching attitude with all the groups.

Coefficient of correlation is found significant and negative between attitude towards teaching profession, classroom teaching and the low socio-economic group of teacher trainees.

Coefficient of correlation is positive and significant between attitude towards pupils and low socio-economic group of teacher trainees.

No significant correlation is found between all the six dimensions of teaching attitude and the average and high socio-economic status of teacher trainees.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the low socio-economic status of teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards teaching profession and classroom teaching.
The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the average socio economic status of teacher trainees is retained.

There is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the high socio economic status of teacher trainees is retained.

**Table 4.2.10**

Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Teaching Attitude And Socio-Economic Status of DIET Teacher Trainees.  
(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=49</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=184</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession</td>
<td>-0.0061 NS</td>
<td>0.0519 NS</td>
<td>0.1917**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>0.0519 NS</td>
<td>0.1056 NS</td>
<td>0.0949 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices</td>
<td>-0.1980**</td>
<td>0.1095 NS</td>
<td>0.0291 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process</td>
<td>-0.2348**</td>
<td>0.1523**</td>
<td>-0.0507 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>-0.1993**</td>
<td>0.1366*</td>
<td>0.043 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.2446**</td>
<td>0.1657**</td>
<td>-0.0321 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Attitude</td>
<td>-0.2057**</td>
<td>0.1761**</td>
<td>0.0642 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SES  Socio-Economic Status  
NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level  
*  Significant at 0.05 level  
**  Significant at 0.01 level
For determining the relationship between teaching attitude and three levels of socio-economic status DIET teacher trainees, the investigator has grouped the DIET teacher trainees into three groups -

Group 1-Low socio-economic status
Group 2-Average socio-economic status
Group 3-High socio-economic status

Teaching Profession

It is clear from the table 4.2.10 that there is positive correlation of 0.0519 between teaching profession and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1917 between teaching profession and group 3 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0061 between teaching profession and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between teaching profession and group 3, while no significant correlation exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 1 and group 2.

Classroom Teaching

It is evident from the table 4.2.10 that there is positive and negligible correlation between classroom teaching and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are 0.0519, 0.1056 and 0.0949 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, it is concluded that no significant correlation is found in classroom teaching and all the groups.
Child-Centered Practices

The table 4.2.10 shows that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.1095 between child-centered practices and group 2. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0291 between child-centered practices and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1980 between child centered practices and group 1 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant negative correlation is found between child centered practices and group 1 while no significant correlation exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 2 and group 3.

Educational Process

It is clear from the table 4.2.10 that there is negative correlation of -0.2348 between educational process and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0507 between educational process and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

There is positive correlation of 0.1523 between educational process and group 2, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between educational process and group 2. Significant negative correlation is found between educational process and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 3.

Pupils

Table 4.2.10 reveals that there is positive correlation of 0.1366 between attitude towards pupils and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.043 between attitude towards
pupils and group 3 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1993 between attitude towards pupils and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between attitude towards pupils and group 2. Significant negative correlation is found between attitude towards pupils and group 2, while no significant correlation exists with group 3.

Teachers

It is clear from the table 4.2.10 that there is negative correlation of -0.2446 between teachers' attitude and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0321 between teachers' attitude and group 3 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is significant positive correlation of 0.1657 between attitude towards teachers and group 2, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between attitude towards pupils and group 2 and significant negative correlation is found between attitude towards pupils and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 3.

Overall Teaching Attitude

It is evident from the table 4.2.10 that there is positive correlation of 0.1761 between overall teaching attitude and group 2, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0642 between overall teaching attitude and group 3 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.2057, between overall teaching attitude and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of
significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between overall teaching attitude and group 2. Also, significant negative correlation is found between overall teaching attitude and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 3.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and negative between

a) attitudes towards child centered practices, educational process, pupils, teachers, overall teaching attitude and the low socio economic group of DIET teacher trainees.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between

a) attitude towards educational process, pupils, teachers, overall attitude and the average socio economic status of DIET teacher trainees.

b) attitude towards teaching profession and high socio economic group of DIET teacher trainees.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the low socio economic status of DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards child centered practices, educational process, pupils teachers and overall attitude.

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the average socio economic status of DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards educational process, pupils, teachers and overall attitude.
The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the high socio economic status of DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to attitude towards teaching profession.

Table 4.2.11

Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Teaching Attitude and Socio-Economic Status of Male Teacher Trainees.

(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Group 1 Low SES N=52</th>
<th>Group 2 Average SES N=195</th>
<th>Group 3 High SES N=53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession</td>
<td>0.0117 NS</td>
<td>0.0200 NS</td>
<td>0.1876**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>-0.1337*</td>
<td>-0.0007 NS</td>
<td>0.162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices</td>
<td>-0.1884**</td>
<td>0.0581 NS</td>
<td>0.1682**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process</td>
<td>-0.2517**</td>
<td>0.0725 NS</td>
<td>0.1687**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>-0.0675 NS</td>
<td>0.0601 NS</td>
<td>0.1451*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.1564**</td>
<td>0.0223 NS</td>
<td>0.1411*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Attitude</td>
<td>-0.1652**</td>
<td>0.0541 NS</td>
<td>0.2229**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SES Socio-Economic Status
NS Not Significant at 0.05 level
* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

For determining the relationship between teaching attitude and three levels of socio-economic status of male teacher trainees, the investigator has grouped the male teacher trainees into three groups-
Group 1 - Low socio-economic status
Group 2 - Average socio-economic status
Group 3 - High socio-economic status

Teaching Profession

It is clear from the table 4.2.11 that there is positive correlation between teaching profession and all the three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. The values are 0.0117, 0.0200 and 0.1876 respectively. Out of which the value of group 3 is significant at 0.01 level while the value of group 1 and group 2 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it is concluded that significant positive correlation is found between teaching profession and group 3, while no significant correlation exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 1 and group 2. Hence, male teacher trainees of high socio-economic status possess favourable attitude towards teaching profession.

Classroom Teaching

It is apparent from the table 4.2.11 that there is negative correlation of -0.1337 between classroom teaching and group 1, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.0007 between classroom teaching and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.162, between classroom teaching and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found in classroom teaching with group 3. Significant negative correlation is found between classroom teaching and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 2.
Child-Centered Practices

It is evident from the table 4.2.11 that there is positive correlation of 0.0581 between child centered practices and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1682 between child centered practices and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.1884 between child centered practices and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between child-centered practices and group 3. Significant negative correlation is found between child centered practices and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 2.

Educational Process

The table 4.2.11 shows that there is positive correlation of 0.0725 between educational process and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1687 between educational process and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level. There is negative correlation of -0.2517, between educational process and group 1 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation is found between educational process and group 3. Significant negative correlation is found between educational process and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 2.

Pupils

It is apparent from the table 4.2.11 that there is positive correlation of 0.0601 between attitude towards pupils and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05
level of significance There is positive correlation of 0.1451 between attitude towards pupils and group 3, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0675 between attitude towards pupils and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, significant positive correlation is found between attitude towards pupils and group 3, while no significant correlation exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 1 and group 2.

Teachers

It is obvious from the table 4.2.11 that there is positive correlation of 0.0223 between attitude towards teachers and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1411 between attitude towards teachers and group 3 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is significant & negative correlation of -0.1564 between attitude towards teachers and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation is found in attitude towards teachers with group 3. Significant negative correlation is found between attitude towards teachers and group1, while no significant correlation exists with group 2.

Overall Teaching Attitude

It is clear from the table 4.2.11 that there is positive correlation of 0.0541 between overall teaching attitude and group 2, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance There is positive correlation of 0.2229 between overall teaching attitude and group 3, which is significant at 0.01 level. There is negative correlation of -0.1652, between overall teaching attitude and group 1,