which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, significant positive

correlation is found between overall teaching attitude and group 1, while no

significant correlation exists with group 2.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and negative between attitudes towards
classroom teaching, child-centered practices, educational process, teachers,
overall attitude and the low socio economic group of male teacher trainees
while no significant correlation exists between all the six dimensions of
teaching attitude and the average socio economic status of male teacher
trainees. Significant positive correlation is found between all the six
dimensions of teaching attitude and the high socio-economic status of male
teacher trainees.

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

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of
teaching attitude and the high socio-economic status of male teacher trainees
is rejected with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude.
Table 4.2.12
Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) Between Teaching Attitude and Socio-Economic Status of Female Teacher Trainees
(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</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>Teaching Profession</td>
<td>-0.274**</td>
<td>0.1268*</td>
<td>0.0030 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>-0.0968 NS</td>
<td>0.04193 NS</td>
<td>0.0525 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices</td>
<td>0.1043 NS</td>
<td>0.1151*</td>
<td>-0.056 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process</td>
<td>0.1148*</td>
<td>0.1239*</td>
<td>-0.0458 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>0.0342 NS</td>
<td>0.0864NS</td>
<td>-0.0254 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.0524 NS</td>
<td>0.1171*</td>
<td>-0.042 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Attitude</td>
<td>-0.0384 NS</td>
<td>0.1439*</td>
<td>-0.0289 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 the 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
Teaching Profession

It is clear from the table 4.2.12 that there is positive correlation of 0.1268 between teaching profession and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.0030 between teaching profession and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative correlation of -0.274 between teaching profession and group 1, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation is found between teaching profession and group 2. Significant negative correlation is found between teaching profession and group 1, while no significant correlation exists with group 3.

Class Room Teaching

It is evident from the table 4.2.12 that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.04193 between classroom teaching and group 2. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0525 between classroom teaching and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0968 between classroom teaching and group 1 which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation is found between classroom teaching and all the groups of teacher trainees.

Child Centered Practices

It is obvious from the table 4.2.12 that there is positive correlation of 0.1043 between child-centered practices and group 1, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is positive correlation of 0.1151 between child-centered practices and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level. There is
negative and negligible correlation of -0.056 between child centered practices and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, significant positive correlation is found in child centered practices with group 2, while no significant correlation exists with rest of the groups i.e group 1 and group 3.

Educational Process

Table 4.2.12 reveals that there is positive correlation of 0.1148 between educational process and group 1. There is positive correlation of 0.1239 between educational process and group 2. Both the values are significant at 0.05 level. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0458 between educational process and group 3, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, significant positive correlation is found between educational process and group 1, group 2, while no significant correlation exists with group 3.

Pupils

The table 4.2.12 shows that there is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0342 between attitude towards pupils and group 1. There is positive and negligible correlation of 0.0864 between attitude towards pupils and group 2. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0254 between attitude towards pupils and group 3 which is again not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant correlation is found between attitude towards pupils and all the groups of teacher trainees.
Teachers

It is apparent from the table 4.2.12 that there is positive correlation of 0.1171, between attitude towards teachers and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0524 between attitude towards teachers and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of 0.042 between attitude towards teachers and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, significant positive correlation is found between attitude towards teachers and group 2, while no significant relation exists with two groups i.e group 1 and group 3.

Overall Teaching Attitude

It is evident from the table 4.2.12 that there is positive correlation of 0.1439 between overall teaching attitude and group 2, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0384 between overall teaching attitude and group 1. There is negative and negligible correlation of -0.0289 between overall teaching attitude and group 3. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it is concluded that significant positive correlation is found between overall teaching attitude and group 2, while no significant relation exists with rest of the two groups i.e group 1 and group 3.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between

a) attitude towards educational process, and the low socio-economic group of female teacher trainees.
b) attitude towards teaching profession, child centered practices, educational process, teachers, overall attitude and the average socio-economic group of female teacher trainees

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

Coefficient of correlation is negative between attitude towards teaching profession and low socio-economic status of female teacher trainees.

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

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

The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between dimensions of teaching attitude and the low socio-economic status of female teacher trainees is retained.
Analysis and Interpretation

Section -2

3 Significant Difference

This data has been further analyzed to test the significance of difference. For testing the significance of the difference between means in each case, ‘t’ test is applied. After the computation of personal values scores, teaching attitude scores and socio-economic status score, further analysis is undertaken to test the hypotheses formulated in the first chapter.

Table 4.3.1

Mean, S.D., t-Values and level of significance of Personal Values Between Male and Female Teacher Trainees

(N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Male (N=300)</th>
<th>Female (N=300)</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value (Ka)</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value (Kha)</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value (Ga)</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value (Cha)</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value (Chha)</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value (Ja)</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value (Jha)</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value (Ta)</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value (Tha)</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at 0.01 level
The data regarding mean and S.D. of the ten personal values along with the ‘t’ value to test the significance of the difference between the means of male and female teacher trainees have been presented in the table 4.3.1. The ‘t’ value for all the personal values is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

Religious Value

Table 4.3.1 reveals that ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 24.06, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that the difference is real and not due to chance factor. The mean score of female teacher trainees is 11.62, while the mean score of male teacher trainees is 7.89. Hence it is found that the female teacher trainees were more religious than their male counterparts.

Social Value

Table 4.3.1 shows the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 13.01, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that the difference is real and not due to chance factor. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 13.69 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 11.72. It means male teacher trainees give more weightage to social value than the female teacher trainees do.

Democratic Value

Table 4.3.1 reveals that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 11.26, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 14.14 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 12.57. Therefore male teacher trainees believe more in
non discrimination on the basis of sex, language religion, caste, colour, race and family status than the female teacher trainees do.

Aesthetic Value

Table 4.3.1 reveals that 't' value between male and female teacher trainees is 19.16, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male and female teacher trainees is 8.02 and 11.21 respectively. It means love for literature, fine arts, decoration of home and surroundings, neatness and system in the arrangement of the things is found more in female teacher trainees than it is found in the male teacher trainees.

Economic Value

Table 4.3.1 reveals that the 't' value between male and female teacher trainees is 3.62, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 11.71 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 12.00. Thus, the economic value is found more in female teacher than it is found in the male teacher trainees.

Knowledge Value

The table 4.3.1 reveals that 't' between male and female teacher trainees value is 12.90, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that the difference is real and not due to chance factor. The mean score of male and female teacher trainees is 12.23 and 10.72 respectively. It means knowledge value is found more in male teacher trainees than is found in the female teacher trainees.
Hedonistic Value

The table 4.3.1 reveals that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 5.10, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees being 12.13 is higher than the mean score of female teacher trainees being 11.64. It means hedonistic value is more in the male teacher trainees than in the female teacher trainees.

Power Value

Table 4.3.1 reveals that ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 4.52, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male and female teacher trainees is 11.83 and 11.39 respectively. It means desirability of ruling over others and also of leading others is found more in male teacher trainees than it is found in the female teacher trainees.

Family Prestige Value

Table 4.3.1 reveals that ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 3.32, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees being 14.80 is higher than the mean score of female teacher trainees being 14.41. It means family prestige value is more in male teacher trainees than it is found in the female teacher trainees.

Health Value

Table 4.3.1 shows that ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees is 6.64, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It is also clear from the table that the mean score of male and female teacher trainees is 13.57 and 12.73 respectively. It means male teacher trainees give more weightage to health value in comparison to the female teacher trainees.
Hence, it can be concluded that female teacher trainees differ significantly from male teacher trainees with respect to their religious, aesthetic and economic values. These values are given higher weightage by female teacher trainees than by male teacher trainees. Similarly male teacher trainees differ significantly from female teacher trainees with respect to social, democratic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health values. These values are given higher weightage by male teacher trainees as compared to female teacher trainees.

The hierarchy or pattern of values for male teacher trainees are family prestige, democratic, social, health, knowledge, hedonistic, power, economic, aesthetic and religious values. The hierarchy or patterns of values for female teacher trainees are family prestige, health, democratic, economic, hedonistic, social, religious, power, aesthetic and knowledge values. Both male and female teacher trainees show the highest rank of family prestige values and the lowest rank of religious, knowledge values respectively.

The hypothesis of this investigation which formulated that there is no significant difference in personal values between the male and female teacher trainees is rejected with respect to all the personal values.
### Table 4.3.2

Mean, S.D., t-Value and level of Significance of Personal Values Between B.Ed. and DIET Teacher Trainees

(N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>B.Ed. (N=300)</th>
<th>DIET (N=300)</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value (Ka)</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value (Kha)</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value (Ga)</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value (Cha)</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value (Chha)</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value (Ja)</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value (Jha)</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value (Ta)</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>15.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value (Tha)</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *NS* Not Significant at 0.05 level
** * Significant at .05 level
** * Significant at 0.01level

The mean and S.D. scores of the ten personal values of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees along with the corresponding ‘t’ value to test the significance of the difference between these means has been presented in table 4.3.2.
Religious Value

Table 4.3.2 reveals that the 't' value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 4.50, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that the obtained difference is real and not due to chance factor. Mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 10.24, while the mean score of B.Ed. teacher trainees is 9.27. Hence, DIET teacher trainees are more religious than the B.Ed. teacher trainees do.

Social Value

Table 4.3.2 shows that the 't' value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 6.93, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. teacher trainees is 13.27, while the mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 12.13. The mean score of B.Ed teacher trainees is higher than the DIET teacher trainees. Therefore, social value is more in B.Ed. teacher trainees than the DIET teacher trainees.

Democratic Value

Table 4.3.2 reveals that the 't' value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 11.26, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed teacher trainees is 14.14, while the mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 12.57. Thus, B.Ed. teacher trainees give more weightage to democratic value than the DIET teacher trainees do.

Aesthetic Value

It is evident from table 4.3.2 that the 't' value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 1.99, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 9.40, 9.82 respectively. It means
love for literature, fine arts, decoration of home and surroundings, neatness and system in the arrangement of the things is found more in DIET teacher trainees than it is found in the B.Ed. teacher trainees.

**Economic Value**

Table 4.3.2 shows that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 0.29, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. teacher trainees is 11.85, while the mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 11.87. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in economic value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees.

**Knowledge Value**

Table 4.3.2 shows that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 6.93, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 11.91 and 11.03 respectively. It means knowledge value is found more in B.Ed. teacher trainees than the DIET teacher trainees.

**Hedonistic Value**

Table 4.3.2 reveals that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 6.21 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. teacher trainees being 11.59 is lower than the mean score of DIET teacher trainees being 12.18. It means hedonistic value is more in DIET teacher trainees than the B.Ed. teacher trainees.
Power Value

Table 4.3.2 reveals that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 8.54 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 12.01 and 11.21 respectively. It means desirability of ruling over others and also of leading others is found more in B.Ed. teacher trainees than it is found the DIET teacher trainees.

Family Prestige Value

From table 4.3.2 it is clear that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 8.95 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. teacher trainees being 14.10 is lower than the mean score of DIET teacher trainees being 15.11. It means family prestige value is found more in the DIET teacher trainees than it is found B.Ed. teacher trainees.

Health Value

It is clear from table 4.3.2 that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed and DIET teacher trainees is 11.29 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 12.45 and 13.85 respectively. It means DIET teacher trainees give more weightage to health value in comparison to B.Ed. teacher trainees.

Therefore, it can be concluded that DIET teacher trainees differ significantly from B.Ed. teacher trainees with respect to their religious, aesthetic, hedonistic family prestige and health value. These values are given higher weightage by DIET teacher trainees than by B.Ed. teacher trainees. Similarly B.Ed. teacher trainees differ significantly from DIET teacher trainees in respect to social, democratic, knowledge, power values. These values are
given higher weightage by B.Ed. teacher trainees as compared to DIET teacher trainees.

The hypothesis of this investigation which formulated that there is no significant difference in personal values between the B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to all the personal values except economic value.

Table 4.3.3
Mean, S.D., t-Values and level of significance of Personal Values between Male and Female Teacher Trainees of B.Ed.
(N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Male (N=150)</th>
<th>Female (N=150)</th>
<th>'t' value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value (Ka)</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value (Kha)</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value (Ga)</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value (Cha)</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value (Chha)</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value (Ja)</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value (Jha)</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value (Ta)</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value (Tha)</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

NS Not significant at 0.05 level
The data regarding mean and S.D. of the ten personal values of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. along with the ‘t’ values to test the significance of the difference between these means has been presented in table 4.3.3.

Religious Value

Table 4.3.3 reveals that the ‘t’ value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 13.68 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance, which means that the difference is real and not due to chance factor. Mean score of female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 10.77, while the mean score of male teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 7.76. Thus, female teacher trainees of B.Ed are more religious than the male teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Social Value

Table 4.3.3 shows that the ‘t’ value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 14.47, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 14.73, while the mean score of female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 11.82. It means that the male teacher trainees of B.Ed. give more weightage to social value than the female teacher trainees of B.Ed do.

Democratic Value

It is clear from the table 4.3.3 that that the ‘t’ value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 10.83, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees of B.Ed is 15.05, while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 13.23. Thus, male teacher
trainees of B.Ed. possess higher magnitude of democratic value than the female teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Aesthetic Value

Table 4.3.3 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 15.58, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 7.42 and 11.39 respectively. It means love for literature, fine arts; decoration of home and surroundings, neatness and system in the arrangement of the things is found more in female teacher trainees of B.Ed. than it is found in the male teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Economic Value

It is clear from the table 4.3.3 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 2.52, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 11.67, while the mean score of female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 12.00. Hence, economic value is found more in female teacher trainees of B.Ed. than it is found in the male teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Knowledge Value

Table 4.3.3 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 10.94, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Mean score of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 12.83 and 11.00 respectively. It means knowledge value is found more in male teacher trainees of B.Ed. than it is found in the female teacher trainees of B.Ed.
Hedonistic Value

It is apparent from the table 4.3.3 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 0.14, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that the difference is not real and may be due to chance factor. The mean score of male teacher trainees of B.Ed. being 11.58 is lower than the mean score of female teacher trainees of B.Ed. being 11.60. It means that there is no significant difference in hedonistic value between the mean scores of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Power Value

Table 4.3.3 shows that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 1.46 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 12.10 and 11.92 respectively. The difference in the mean scores is negligible. It means there is no difference exists in desirability of ruling over others and also of leading between male teacher trainees of B.Ed. and the female teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Family Prestige Value

Table 4.3.3 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 0.00, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance it means that the difference is not real and may be due to chance factor. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. are same i.e. 14.10. It means there is no difference in family prestige value between male teacher trainees of B.Ed. and the female teacher trainees of B.Ed.
Health Value

It is clear from table 4.3.3 that the ‘t’ value for male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is 4.01, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance it means that the difference is real and not due to chance factor. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. are 12.73 and 12.17 respectively. As the mean score of male teacher trainees of B.Ed. is higher, it means that the male teacher trainees of B.Ed. give more weightage to health value in comparison to the female teacher trainees of B.Ed.

Therefore, it can be concluded that female teacher trainees of B.Ed. differ significantly from male teacher trainees of B.Ed. with respect to their religious, aesthetic, economic values. These values are given higher weightage by female teacher trainees of B.Ed. than by male teacher trainees of B.Ed. Similarly male teacher trainees of B.Ed. differ significantly from female teacher trainees of B.Ed. with respect to social, democratic, knowledge, and health values. These values are given higher weightage by male teacher trainees of B.Ed. as compared to female teacher trainees of B.Ed.

The hypothesis of this investigation which formulated that there is no significant difference in personal values between the male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is rejected with respect to all the personal values except and hedonistic, power, family prestige Values.
Table 4.3.4
Mean, S.D., t-Value and level of significance of Personal Values between Male and Female Teacher Trainees of DIET (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Male (N=150)</th>
<th>Female (N=150)</th>
<th>t' Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value(Ka)</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>12.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value(Kha)</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value(Ga)</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value(Gha)</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value(Cha)</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value(Chha)</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value(Ja)</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value(Jha)</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value(Ta)</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value(Tha)</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 0.01 level

The data regarding mean and S.D. of the ten personal values of male and female teacher trainees of DIET along with the 't' value to test the significance of the difference between means of male and female teacher trainees of DIET has been presented in table 4.3.4. The 't' value for all the personal values is significant at 0.01 level of significance.
Religious Value

The table 4.3.4 reveals the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 22.76, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means that the difference is apparent and not due to chance factor. The mean score of female teacher trainees of DIET is 12.46, while the mean score of male teacher trainees of DIET is 8.01. Therefore, female teacher trainees of DIET are more religious than the male teacher trainees of DIET do.

Social Value

Table 4.3.4 shows that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 5.38 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees of DIET is 12.65, while the mean score of female teacher trainees of DIET is 11.61. It means male teacher trainees of DIET give more weightage to social value than the female teacher trainees of DIET do.

Democratic Value

It is clear from the table 4.3.4 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 7.28, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 13.22, while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 11.91. Thus male teacher trainees of DIET possess higher magnitude of democratic value than the female teacher trainees of DIET.

Aesthetic Value

Table 4.3.4 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 11.87, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees of DIET are 8.61 and 11.03
respectively. The mean score of female teacher trainees of DIET is higher, it means love for literature, fine arts; decoration of home and surroundings, neatness and system in the arrangement of the things is found more in female teacher trainees of DIET than it is found in the male teacher trainees of DIET.

Economic Value

It is clear from the table 4.3.4 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 2.65, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees of DIET is 11.74, while the mean score of female teacher trainees of DIET is 12.00. Thus, it can be interpreted as - the economic value is found more in female teacher trainees of DIET than the male teacher trainees of DIET.

Knowledge Value

Table 4.3.4 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 8.20 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 11.63 and 10.44 respectively. It means knowledge value is found more in male teacher trainees of DIET than the female teacher trainees of DIET.

Hedonistic Value

It is apparent from the table 4.3.4 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 8.58 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees of DIET being 12.67 is higher than the mean score of female teacher trainees of DIET being 11.68. It means there is significant difference in hedonistic value between the mean scores of male
and female teacher trainees of DIET. Hedonistic value of male teacher
trainees is more than the female teacher trainees.

Power Value

Table 4.3.4 shows that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of
DIET is 5.18 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean
scores of male and female teacher trainees of DIET are 11.56 and 10.85
respectively. It means male teacher trainees show more desirability of ruling
over others and also of leading than the female teacher trainees of DIET.

Family Prestige Value

Table 4.3.4 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees of
DIET is 4.81 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean
scores of male and female teacher trainees of DIET are 15.50 and 14.71. It
means there is significant difference in family prestige value between male
teacher trainees of DIET and the female teacher trainees of DIET.

Health Value

It is clear from table 4.3.4 that the 't' value for male and female teacher
trainees of DIET is 6.37 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The
mean scores of male and female teacher trainees of DIET are 14.40 and
13.29 respectively. It means male teacher trainees of DIET give more
weightage to health value in comparison to female teacher trainees of DIET.

Therefore, it can be concluded that female teacher trainees of DIET differ
significantly from male teacher trainees of DIET in respect to their religious,
aesthetic, economic values. These values are given higher weightage by
female teacher trainees of DIET than by male teacher trainees of DIET. Similarly male teacher trainees of DIET differ significantly from female teacher trainees of DIET in respect to social, democratic, knowledge, hedonistic, and health values. These values are given higher weightage by male teacher trainees of DIET as compared to female teacher trainees of DIET. Both male and female teacher trainees show the highest magnitude of family prestige value and lowest magnitude of religious, knowledge values respectively.

The hypothesis of this investigation which formulated that there is no significant difference in personal values between the male and female teacher trainees of DIET is rejected with respect to all the personal values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group a (N=150)</th>
<th>Group b (N=150)</th>
<th>Group c (N=150)</th>
<th>Group d (N=150)</th>
<th>G1 Vs G2</th>
<th>G1 Vs G3</th>
<th>G1 Vs G4</th>
<th>G2 Vs G3</th>
<th>G2 Vs G4</th>
<th>G3 Vs G4</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Value (Ky)</td>
<td>7.76 1.19</td>
<td>10.77 2.42</td>
<td>8.01 1.43</td>
<td>12.5 1.92</td>
<td>13.66**</td>
<td>1.65NS</td>
<td>25.76**</td>
<td>12.05**</td>
<td>6.66**</td>
<td>22.76**</td>
<td>236.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Value (Kha)</td>
<td>14.72 1.13</td>
<td>11.82 2.19</td>
<td>12.7 1.91</td>
<td>11.6 1.37</td>
<td>14.47**</td>
<td>11.15**</td>
<td>21.52**</td>
<td>3.71**</td>
<td>1.64NS</td>
<td>5.38**</td>
<td>104.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>15.05 1.05</td>
<td>13.23 1.78</td>
<td>13.21 1.71</td>
<td>11.9 1.4</td>
<td>10.83**</td>
<td>11.11**</td>
<td>22.50**</td>
<td>0.00NS</td>
<td>7.19**</td>
<td>7.28**</td>
<td>109.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value (Gha)</td>
<td>7.42 1.08</td>
<td>11.39 2.92</td>
<td>8.61 1.66</td>
<td>11 1.86</td>
<td>15.58**</td>
<td>7.36**</td>
<td>20.51**</td>
<td>10.15**</td>
<td>1.27NS</td>
<td>11.87**</td>
<td>137.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Value (Cha)</td>
<td>11.69 1.17</td>
<td>12.01 1.02</td>
<td>11.7 0.87</td>
<td>12 0.83</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>0.70NS</td>
<td>2.65*</td>
<td>2.84**</td>
<td>0.09NS</td>
<td>2.65**</td>
<td>4.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Value (Chha)</td>
<td>12.83 1.2</td>
<td>11 1.65</td>
<td>11.6 1.31</td>
<td>10.4 1.19</td>
<td>10.94**</td>
<td>8.48**</td>
<td>17.32**</td>
<td>3.49**</td>
<td>3.37**</td>
<td>8.20**</td>
<td>85.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Value (Ja)</td>
<td>11.58 1.33</td>
<td>11.6 1.04</td>
<td>12.7 0.95</td>
<td>10.7 1.05</td>
<td>0.14NS</td>
<td>0.68NS</td>
<td>6.38**</td>
<td>9.56**</td>
<td>7.44**</td>
<td>8.58**</td>
<td>34.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Value (Jha)</td>
<td>12.1 1.19</td>
<td>11.92 0.92</td>
<td>11.6 1.05</td>
<td>10.9 1.29</td>
<td>1.46NS</td>
<td>3.86**</td>
<td>8.39**</td>
<td>2.81**</td>
<td>7.91**</td>
<td>5.18**</td>
<td>36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Value (Ta)</td>
<td>14.1 1.32</td>
<td>14.1 1.23</td>
<td>15.5 1.55</td>
<td>14.7 1.26</td>
<td>0.00NS</td>
<td>8.43**</td>
<td>4.03**</td>
<td>8.70**</td>
<td>4.17**</td>
<td>4.81**</td>
<td>35.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Value (Tha)</td>
<td>12.73 1.25</td>
<td>12.17 1.2</td>
<td>14.4 1.68</td>
<td>13.3 1.31</td>
<td>4.01**</td>
<td>9.77**</td>
<td>3.85**</td>
<td>13.20**</td>
<td>7.79**</td>
<td>6.37**</td>
<td>72.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS Not Significant at 0.05 level
* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
Male Teacher Trainees of B.Ed. (Group a)
- Female Teacher Trainees of B.Ed. (Group b)
- Male Teacher Trainees of DIET (Group c)
- Female Teacher Trainees of DIET (Group d)

The 'f' value is significant at 0.01 level of significance for all the personal values. The mean and S.D. scores of the ten personal values of the B.Ed. male and female teacher trainees and the DIET male and female teacher trainees are summarized in table 4.3.5. The mean score of the four groups have been compared with respect to ten personal values.

**Religious Value**

It is apparent from the table 4.3.5 that the mean score of group d is 12.50 which is highest and the mean score of group a is 7.76 which is the lowest in respect to their religious value. There is significant difference in religious value between group a and group b, group a and group d, group b and group d, group c and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group c.

**Social Value**

It is apparent from table 4.3.5 that the mean score of group a is 14.72, which is highest while the mean scores of group b, group c, and group d are 11.82, 12.70 and 11.60 respectively. There is significant difference in social value between group a and group b, group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group c and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group b and group d.
Democratic Value

It is evident from the table 4.3.5 that the mean scores of group a being 15.05 is highest than the mean scores of group b, group c, group d being 13.23,13.23 and11.90 respectively. There is significant difference in democratic value between group a and group b, group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group d, group c and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group b and group c.

Aesthetic Value

It is apparent from the table 4.3.5. that the mean scores of group b is 11.39 which is highest while the mean scores of group a, group c and group d are 7.42, 8.61 and 11.03 respectively .There is significant difference in aesthetic value between group a and group b, group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group c and group d at 0.01level but no significant difference is found between group b and group d.

Economic Value

It is clear from the table 4.3.5  that the mean scores of group b is 12.01 which is highest while the mean scores of group a, group c and group d are 11.69, 11.74 and 12.00 respectively. There is significant difference in economic value between group a and group b, group a and group d, group b and group c at 0.05 level. There is significant difference in economic value between group c and group d at 0.01 level but there is no significant difference found between group a and group c and group b and group d.
Knowledge Value

It is evident from the table 4.3.5 that the mean scores of group a is 12.83 which is highest while the mean scores of group b, group c and group d are 11.00, 11.62 and 10.44 respectively. There is significant difference in knowledge value between group a and group b, group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d, group c and group d at 0.01 level. Thus all the groups vary with each other in respect to knowledge value.

Hedonistic Value

It is apparent from the table 4.3.5 that the mean scores of group c being 12.70 is highest than the mean scores of group a, group b and group d being 11.58, 11.60, 10.70 respectively. There is significant difference in hedonistic value between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b, group b and group d.

Power Value

It is clear from the able 4.3.5 that the mean scores of group a is 12.10 which is highest while the mean scores of group b, group c, group d are 11.92, 11.60 and 10.85 respectively. There is significant difference in power value between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d, group c and group d at 0.01 level but there is no significant difference is found between group a and group b.
Family Prestige Value

It is apparent from the table 4.3.5. that the mean scores of group c is 15.50 which is highest while the mean scores of group a, group b and group d are 14.10, 14.10 and 14.70 respectively. There is significant difference in family prestige value between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d, group c and group d at 0.01 level but there is no significant difference found between group a and group b.

Health Value

It is evident from the table 4.3.5 that the mean score of group c is 14.40 which is highest while the mean scores of group a, group b and group d are 12.73, 12.17 and 13.30 respectively. There is significant difference in health value between group a and group b, group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d, group c and group d at 0.01 level. Hence, all the groups vary with each other in respect to health value.

Hence, it can be concluded that female teacher trainees differ significantly from male teacher trainees with respect to their religious and aesthetic values. These values are given higher weightage by female teacher trainees than by male teacher trainees. Similarly male teacher trainees differ significantly from female teacher trainees with respect to social, democratic, knowledge, power and health values. These values are given higher weightage by male teacher trainees as compared to female teacher trainees. Female teacher trainees have higher magnitude of religious and aesthetic values while the male teacher trainees possess higher magnitude of social, democratic, knowledge, hedonistic, power and health values.
Analysis of Attitude Scores

The scores pertaining to attitude of teacher trainees have been subjected to further statistical analysis by calculating Mean and S.D. of attitude of different categories of teacher trainees.

**Table 4.3.6**

Mean, S.D., t-value and level of significance of Teaching Attitude between Male and Female Teacher Trainees

*(N=600)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Male (N=300)</th>
<th>Female (N=300)</th>
<th>'t' Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession(I)</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching(II)</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>38.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices (III)</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>42.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process(IV)</td>
<td>43.19</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>43.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (V)</td>
<td>45.15</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>45.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (VI)</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>41.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>252.27</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>252.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS Not Significant at 0.05 level*

The mean and S.D of attitude scores of male and female teacher trainees have been computed and compared and the results are shown in table 4.3.6. The 't' value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance for all the six dimensions of teaching attitude.
Teaching Profession

Table 4.3.6 reveals that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.11 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means the difference is not real and may be, due to chance factor. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 40.96 and 41.00 respectively. It means there is no difference in attitude towards teaching profession between male and female teacher trainees.

Classroom Teaching

It is clear from table 4.3.6 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.12, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 38.60 and 38.64 respectively, which is negligible. Therefore there is no difference in attitude towards classroom teaching between male and female teacher trainees.

Child-Centered Practices

Table 4.3.6 shows that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.10, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male teacher trainees is 42.64 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 42.69 and this difference in the mean scores of male and female teacher trainees is negligible. It means there is no difference in attitude towards child-centered practices between male and female teacher trainees.

Educational Process

It is apparent from table 4.3.6 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.17, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 43.19 and 43.26
respectively. Therefore there is no difference in attitude towards educational process between male and female teacher trainees.

Pupils

Table 4.3.6 shows that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.14, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Mean scores of male teacher trainees are 45.15 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 45.24 and this difference in the mean scores of male and female teacher trainees is negligible. It means there is no difference in attitude towards pupils between male and female teacher trainees.

Teachers

It is evident from table 4.3.6 that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.02, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 41.73 and 41.72 respectively and this difference is negligible. Therefore there is no difference in attitude towards teachers between male and female teacher trainees.

Total Attitude

The table 4.3.6 shows that the 't' value for male and female teacher trainees is 0.13, which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Mean scores of male teacher trainees are 252.27 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 252.55 and this difference in the mean scores of male and female teacher trainees is negligible. It means there is no difference in total attitude between male and female teacher trainees.
The table as a whole clearly indicates that the mean scores of attitude of female teacher trainees ranges from 38.64 to 45.26 while the mean scores of attitude of male teacher trainees ranges from 38.60 to 45.15. Thus, the hypothesis there is no significant difference in teaching attitude between male and female teacher trainees is retained with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude.

### Table 4.3.7

Mean, S.D., t-value and level of significance of Teaching Attitude Between B.Ed. and DIET Teacher Trainees

(N=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>B.Ed (N=300)</th>
<th>DIET (N=300)</th>
<th>’t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession (I)</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>39.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching (II)</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>37.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices (III)</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>41.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process (IV)</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>41.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (V)</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>42.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (VI)</td>
<td>43.49</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>261.05</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>243.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at 0.01 levels**

It is clear from table 4.3.7 that the ‘t’ value is significant at 0.01 level of significance for all the six dimensions of teaching attitude.
Teaching Profession

Table 4.3.7 reveals the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 7.48, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It means the difference is real and not due to chance factor. The mean scores of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees are 42.57 and 39.39 respectively and this difference in the mean scores of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is not negligible. It means B.Ed. teacher trainees shows favourable attitudes towards teaching profession in comparison with DIET teacher trainees.

Classroom Teaching

It is clear from table 4.3.7 that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 4.02, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees are 39.35 and 37.89 respectively and this difference is significant. Thus, B.Ed. teacher trainees show favourable attitudes towards classroom teaching in comparison with DIET teacher trainees.

Child Centered Practices

Table 4.3.7 shows that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 3.68 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of B.Ed. teacher trainees is 43.51 while the mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 41.82. It means there is significant difference in attitude towards child centered practices between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees and favourable attitude towards child centered practices is shown by B.Ed. teacher trainees.
Educational Process

It is apparent from table 4.3.7 that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 7.23 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of and DIET teacher trainees are 44.74 and 41.71 respectively and this difference is significant. Hence, B.Ed. teacher trainees show favourable attitudes towards educational process in comparison with DIET teacher trainees.

Pupils

Table 4.3.7 shows that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 7.80 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of B.Ed. teacher trainees is 47.40 while the mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 42.99 and this difference in the mean scores of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is significant. It means there is significant difference in attitude towards pupils between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees and favourable attitude towards pupils is shown by B.Ed. teacher trainees.

Teachers

It is apparent from table 4.3.7 that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 8.31, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees are 43.49 and 39.96 respectively. Therefore B.Ed. teacher trainees show more favourable attitude towards teachers in comparison with DIET teacher trainees.

Total Attitude

Table 4.3.7 shows that the ‘t’ value between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is 8.48 which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores of
B.Ed. teacher trainees are 261.05 while the mean score of DIET teacher trainees is 243.76. Hence, the attitude of B.Ed. teacher trainees is found to be more favourable in comparison with DIET teacher trainees.

Hence from the above analysis, it is clear that the mean scores of attitude of B.Ed. teacher trainees ranges from 39.35 to 47.40 while the mean scores of attitude of DIET teacher trainees ranges from 37.89 to 42.99. It is also obvious from the table that B.Ed. teacher trainees found to possess favourable teaching attitude with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude.

Thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference in teaching attitude between B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees is rejected with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude.

It is therefore concluded that teacher trainees of B.Ed. have higher or favourable teaching attitude in all the six areas or dimensions than DIET teacher trainees.
Table 4.3.8
Mean, S.D., t-Value and level of significance of Teaching Attitude between Male and Female Teacher Trainees of B.Ed. (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Male (N=150) Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Female (N=150) Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession(I)</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.09 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching(II)</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.23 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices(III)</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>.11 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process(IV)</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.18 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (V)</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>47.42</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>.06 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (VI)</td>
<td>43.52</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.11 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>260.89</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>261.22</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>.11 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS Not Significant at 0.05 level

It is clear from table 4.3.8 that the ‘t’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Teaching Profession

Table 4.3.8 reveals that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.09 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means the difference is not real and may be due to chance factor. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 42.54 and 42.59 respectively and this difference in the mean scores of male and female teacher trainees is
negligible. It means there is no difference in attitude towards teaching profession between male and female teacher trainees.

Classroom Teaching

It is clear from table 4.3.8 that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.23 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 39.29 and 39.41 respectively. Therefore there is no difference in attitude towards classroom teaching between male and female teacher trainees.

Child Centered Practices

Table 4.3.8 shows that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.11 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 43.47 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 43.55. It means there is no difference in attitude towards child centered practices between male and female teacher trainees.

Educational Process

It is apparent from table 4.3.8 that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.18 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 44.69 and 44.79 respectively which is negligible. Thus, there is no difference in attitude towards educational process between male and female teacher trainees.
Pupils

Table 4.3.8 shows that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.06 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 47.37 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 47.42. It means there is no difference in attitude towards pupils between male and female teacher trainees.

Teachers

It is apparent from table 4.3.8 that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.11 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 43.52 and 43.45 respectively which is negligible. Thus, there is no difference in attitude towards teachers between male and female teacher trainees.

Total Attitude

Table 4.3.8 shows that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed is 0.11 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 260.89 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 261.22. It means there is no difference in total attitude between male and female teacher trainees.

Hence from the above analysis it is clear that the mean scores of attitude of female teacher trainees ranges from 39.41 to 47.42 while the mean scores of attitude of male teacher trainees ranges from 39.29 to 47.37. It is therefore concluded that attitude towards teaching does not vary with respect to sex.
Thus, the hypothesis there is no significant difference in teaching attitude between male and female teacher trainees of B.Ed. is retained with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Male (N=150)</th>
<th>Female (N=150)</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession(I)</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>39.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching(II)</td>
<td>37.90</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>37.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices (III)</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process(IV)</td>
<td>41.69</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>41.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils(V)</td>
<td>42.93</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>43.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers(VI)</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>39.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Teaching Attitude</td>
<td>243.65</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>243.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level

The mean and S.D. of attitude scores of male and female teacher trainees of DIET have been computed and compared and the results are shown in table 4.3.9. The ‘t’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance for all the six dimensions of teaching attitude.

Teaching Profession

Table 4.3.9 reveals that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.06 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It
means the difference is not real and may be due to chance factor. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees which are 39.37 and 39.41 respectively and this difference in the mean scores of male and female teacher trainees is negligible. It means there is no difference in attitude towards teaching profession between male and female teacher trainees.

**Classroom Teaching**

It is clear from table 4.3.9 that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.05 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 37.90 and 37.87 respectively. So it can be interpreted as - there is no difference in attitude towards classroom teaching between male and female teacher trainees.

**Child Centered Practices**

Table 4.3.9 shows that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.02 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 41.81 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 41.83. It means there is no difference in attitude towards child centered practices between male and female teacher trainees.

**Educational Process**

It is apparent from table 4.3.9 that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.07 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 41.69 and 41.73 respectively. Hence, there is no difference in attitude towards educational process between male and female teacher trainees.
Pupils

Table 4.3.9 shows that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.16 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male teacher trainees is 42.93 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 43.05. It means there is no difference in attitude towards pupils between male and female teacher trainees.

Teachers

It is apparent from table 4.3.9 that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.08 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of male and female teacher trainees are 39.93 and 39.98 respectively which is negligible. Therefore there is no difference in attitude towards teachers between male and female teacher trainees.

Overall Teaching Attitude

Table 4.3.9 shows that the ‘t’ value between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is 0.08 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher trainees is 243.65 while the mean score of female teacher trainees is 243.89. It means there is no difference in total attitude between male and female teacher trainees.

Hence from the above analysis, it is clear that the mean scores of attitude of female teacher trainees range from 37.87 to 43.05 while the mean scores of attitude of male teacher trainees of DIET range from 37.90 to 42.93. It is therefore concluded that attitude towards teaching does not vary with respect to sex.
Thus, the hypothesis there is no significant difference in teaching attitude between male and female teacher trainees of DIET is retained with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Group a (N=150)</th>
<th>Group b (N=150)</th>
<th>Group c (N=150)</th>
<th>Group d (N=150)</th>
<th>G1 Vs G2 t value</th>
<th>G1 Vs G3 t value</th>
<th>G1 Vs G4 t value</th>
<th>G2 Vs G3 t value</th>
<th>G2 Vs G4 t value</th>
<th>G3 Vs G4 t value</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>0.09NS</td>
<td>5.24**</td>
<td>5.13**</td>
<td>5.13**</td>
<td>5.32**</td>
<td>0.06NS</td>
<td>18.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.24**</td>
<td>5.13**</td>
<td>5.13**</td>
<td>5.32**</td>
<td>0.06NS</td>
<td>18.57*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching (II)</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.23NS</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
<td>0.05NS</td>
<td>5.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37.90</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.23NS</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
<td>0.05NS</td>
<td>5.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.23NS</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
<td>0.05NS</td>
<td>5.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices (III)</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>2.64*</td>
<td>0.02NS</td>
<td>4.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>2.64*</td>
<td>0.02NS</td>
<td>4.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
<td>2.64*</td>
<td>0.02NS</td>
<td>4.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process (IV)</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.18NS</td>
<td>5.06**</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>5.17**</td>
<td>0.07NS</td>
<td>17.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.69</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.18NS</td>
<td>5.06**</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>5.17**</td>
<td>0.07NS</td>
<td>17.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.18NS</td>
<td>5.06**</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>5.17**</td>
<td>0.07NS</td>
<td>17.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils (V)</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>47.42</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>0.06NS</td>
<td>5.62**</td>
<td>5.40**</td>
<td>5.61**</td>
<td>5.46**</td>
<td>0.16NS</td>
<td>20.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>42.93</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>43.05</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.06NS</td>
<td>5.62**</td>
<td>5.40**</td>
<td>5.61**</td>
<td>5.46**</td>
<td>0.16NS</td>
<td>20.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.06NS</td>
<td>5.62**</td>
<td>5.40**</td>
<td>5.61**</td>
<td>5.46**</td>
<td>0.16NS</td>
<td>20.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (VI)</td>
<td>43.52</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>5.93**</td>
<td>5.84**</td>
<td>5.87**</td>
<td>5.80**</td>
<td>0.08NS</td>
<td>22.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>5.93**</td>
<td>5.84**</td>
<td>5.87**</td>
<td>5.80**</td>
<td>0.08NS</td>
<td>22.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>5.93**</td>
<td>5.84**</td>
<td>5.87**</td>
<td>5.80**</td>
<td>0.08NS</td>
<td>22.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>260.88</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>261.22</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>0.48NS</td>
<td>23.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>243.64</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>243.88</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>0.48NS</td>
<td>23.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>0.11NS</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>5.98**</td>
<td>0.48NS</td>
<td>23.90**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS Not Significant at 0.05 level.
* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at 0.01 level.
The Mean and S.D. scores of the six areas or dimensions of teaching attitude of B.Ed. male and female teacher trainees and DIET male and female teacher trainees are summarized in table 4.3.10. The mean values of the following four Groups have been compared with respect to six attitudes or dimensions of teaching attitude one by one. The 'f' value is significant at 0.05 or 0.01 level of significance.

- Male Teacher Trainees of B.Ed. (Group a)
- Female Teacher Trainees of B.Ed. (Group b)
- Male Teacher Trainees of DIET (Group c)
- Female Teacher Trainees of DIET (Group d)

Teaching Profession

It is apparent from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group b is 42.59 which is highest and the mean score of group c is 39.37 which is lowest with respect to their teaching profession. There is significant difference in attitude towards teaching profession between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group band group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d.

Classroom Teaching

It is apparent from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group b is 39.41 which is highest. It is more than the mean scores of group a, group c and group d which are 39.29, 37.90 and 37.87 respectively. There is significant difference in attitude towards classroom teaching between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d at 0.01 level but no
significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d.

**Child Centered Practices**

It is evident from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group b is 43.55 which is highest. It is more than the mean scores of group a, group c and group d which are 43.47, 41.81 and 41.83 respectively. There is significant difference in attitude towards child centered practices between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d.

**Educational Process**

It is apparent from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group b is 44.79 which is highest. It is more than the mean score of group a, group c and group d which are 44.69, 41.69 and 41.73 respectively. There is significant difference in attitude towards educational process between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d.

**Pupils**

It is clear from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group c is 42.93 which is highest. It is more than the mean score of group a, group b and group d which are 47.37, 47.42 and 43.05 respectively. There is significant difference in attitude towards pupil between group a and group c, group a and group d,
group b and group c, group b and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d.

Teachers
It is evident from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group a is 43.52 which is highest. It is more than the mean score of group b, group c and group d which are 43.45, 39.93 and 39.98 respectively. There is significant difference in attitude towards teachers between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d.

Overall Teaching Attitude
It is apparent from table 4.3.10 that the mean score of group b is 261.22 which is highest. It is more than the mean score of group a, group c and group d which are 260.88, 243.64 and 243.88 respectively. There is significant difference in overall teaching attitude between group a and group c, group a and group d, group b and group c, group b and group d at 0.01 level but no significant difference is found between group a and group b and group c and group d which clearly indicates that teaching attitude does not vary with sex.

Hence from the above analysis, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the attitude of male and female teacher trainees but there is significant difference in the teaching attitude of B.Ed. and DIET teacher trainees. It is found that B.Ed. teacher trainees have more favourable attitude as compared to the DIET teacher trainees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>'t' value Group 1and2</th>
<th>'t' value Group 1and3</th>
<th>'t' value Group 2and3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Values (Ka)</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.94 NS</td>
<td>1.91 NS</td>
<td>1.46 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Values (Kha)</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.92 NS</td>
<td>1.71 NS</td>
<td>0.090 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Values (Ga)</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.22 NS</td>
<td>1.50 NS</td>
<td>1.01 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Values (Gha)</td>
<td>9.172</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.75 NS</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>0.65 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Values (Cha)</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.25 NS</td>
<td>0.92 NS</td>
<td>1.66 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Values (Chha)</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.97 NS</td>
<td>1.42 NS</td>
<td>0.79 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonistic Values (Ja)</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.33 NS</td>
<td>0.20 NS</td>
<td>0.090 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Values (Jha)</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.60 NS</td>
<td>1.17 NS</td>
<td>0.91 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Prestige Values (Ta)</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.88 NS</td>
<td>0.28 NS</td>
<td>0.60 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Values (Tha)</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.10 NS</td>
<td>1.71 NS</td>
<td>0.12 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS  Not Significant at 0.05 level
* Significant at 0.05 level
For determining the significance of difference between personal values and various levels of socio-economic status, the investigator has grouped the sample into the following three groups on the basis of socio-economic status:

- Group 1 - Low socio-economic status
- Group 2 - Average socio-economic status
- Group 3 - High socio-economic status
- SES - Socio-economic status score

The mean value of these groups have been compared with respect to personal values one by one and summarized in table 4.3.11.

**Religious Values**

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the ‘t’ values for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.94, 1.91 and 1.46 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that the difference is not real and may be due to chance factor. The mean score of group 3 is 10.13 while the mean score of group 2 and group 1 are 9.72, 9.44 respectively. Although the difference in means of these three groups exists but it is negligible. Thus, there is no significant difference exists between religious values and the teacher trainees of three groups. Thus it can be interpreted that religious values do not depend on socio-economic status.

**Social Values**

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the ‘t’ value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.92, 1.71, 0.090 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 12.90, which is more than the mean score of group -2, group 3 which are 12.67 and 12.57.
respectively. No significant difference in social values exists between all the three groups. Hence, the social values of teacher trainees does not depend on socio-economic status.

**Democratic Values**

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value of democratic value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.22, 1.50 and 1.01 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 13.60 while the mean score of group –2 and group 3 are 13.33 and 13.21 respectively. Although the difference in means of these three groups exists but it is negligible. Therefore, there is no significant difference exists between democratic values and the teacher trainees of three groups i.e. Group 1, 2 & 3. Thus, democratic values does not depend on socioeconomic status.

**Aesthetic Values**

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.75, 2.00 and 0.65 respectively out of which the 't' value of group 1 and 2, group 2 and 3 are not significant at 0.05 level of significance while for group 1 and 3 it is significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means that the difference is real and not due to chance factor for group 1 and 3 but for groups 1 and 2 and groups 2 and 3 the difference may be due to chance factor. The mean score of group 3 is 9.83 which is more than the mean score of group –2, group 3 which are 9.172 and 9.66 respectively. Significant difference exists between group 1 and group 3 while no significant difference exists between aesthetic values and rest of the groups i.e group 2 and 3,
group 1 and 2. It means love for literature, neatness and system in the arrangement of the things, Interest in dance, music is more in teacher trainees of high socio economic status than teacher trainees of group 1 i.e. low socio economic group.

**Economic Values**

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.25 and 0.92, 1.66 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 3 is 11.97 while the mean score of group 1 and group 2 are 11.85 and 11.82 respectively. Although the difference in means of these three groups exists but it is negligible. Hence there is no significant difference exists between economic values and the teacher trainees of three groups. Thus, economic values does not depend on socioeconomic status.

**Knowledge Values**

It is evident from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.97, 1.42 and 0.79 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 11.65 which is more than the mean score of group 2, group 3 which are 11.48 and 11.35 respectively. No significant difference exists between knowledge values and all the three groups. Therefore knowledge values of teacher trainees does not depend on socio-economic status.

**Hedonistic Values**

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.33, 0.20 and 0.090 respectively which are not
significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 11.91 while the mean score of group 2 and group 3 are 11.87 and 11.88 respectively. Although the difference in means of these three groups exists but it is negligible. Thus there is no significant difference exists between hedonistic values and the teacher trainees of three groups. So it can be interpreted that hedonistic values does not depend on socioeconomic status.

Power Values

It is apparent from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.60, 1.17 and 0.91 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 11.71 which is more than the mean score of group 2, group 3 which are 11.62 and 11.51 respectively. It is clear that no significant difference exists between power values and all the three groups. Hence, power values of teacher trainees does not depend on socio-economic status.

Family Prestige Values

It is evident from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.88, 0.28 and 0.60 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 2 is 14.65 which is more than the mean score of group 1, group 3 which are 14.50 and 14.56 respectively. No significant difference exists between family prestige values and all the three groups. Hence, family prestige values of teacher trainees does not depend on socio-economic status.
Health Values

It is clear from table 4.3.11 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.10, 1.71 and 0.12 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 13.36 which is more than the mean score of group –2, group 3 which are 13.15 and 13.00 respectively. Therefore health values of teacher trainees does not depend on socio-economic status.

Hence from the above analysis, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between group 1, group 2 and group 3 with respect to all the personal values like religious, social democratic economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health. But significant difference is found between group 1 and group 3 in aesthetic value only. This is higher in group 3 than group 1.

Hence the hypothesis that there is no variation on personal values of teacher trainees due to their socio-economic status is retained with respect to all the personal values except aesthetic values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>'t' value Group 1 and 2</th>
<th>'t' value Group 1 and 3</th>
<th>'t' value Group 2 and 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>40.98</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.13 NS</td>
<td>1.52 NS</td>
<td>0.74 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.80 NS</td>
<td>1.88 NS</td>
<td>0.84 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Centered Practices</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>42.70</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.15 NS</td>
<td>0.43 NS</td>
<td>0.43 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>43.05</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.96 NS</td>
<td>0.34 NS</td>
<td>0.63 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>44.48</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>45.47</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.23 NS</td>
<td>0.37 NS</td>
<td>0.86 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>42.18</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.53 NS</td>
<td>0.71 NS</td>
<td>0.48 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Attitude</td>
<td>249.95</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>253.65</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>252.98</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>1.27 NS</td>
<td>2.66**</td>
<td>0.25 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS Not Significant at 0.05 level
* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
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For determining the significance of difference between teaching attitude and socio-economic status, the investigator has grouped the sample into the following three groups on the basis of socio-economic status:

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

SES - Stands for socio-economic status score.

The mean value of these three groups have been compared with respect to personal values one by one and summarized in table 4.3.12.

Teaching Profession

It is apparent from table 4.3.12 that the ‘t’ value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.13, 1.52 and 0.74 respectively, which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It means the difference is not real and this may be, due to chance factor. The mean score of group 3 is 41.38 and the mean score of group 1, group 2 are 40.30 and 40.98 respectively. No significant difference exists between attitude towards teaching profession and all the three groups. Thus, attitude of teacher trainees towards teaching profession does not depend on socio-economic status.

Classroom Teaching

It is evident from table 4.3.12 that the ‘t’ value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.80, 1.88 and 0.84 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 3 is 39.05 and the mean score of group 1, group 2 are 37.92 and 38.64 respectively. Thus,
attitude of teacher trainees towards classroom teaching does not depend on socio-economic status.

Child-Centered Practices

It is clear from table 4.3.12 that the ‘t’ value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.15, 0.43 and 0.43 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 1 is 42.79 and the mean score of group 2, group 3 are 42.70 and 42.45 respectively. Therefore attitude of teacher trainees towards child centered practices does not depend on socio-economic status.

Educational Process

It is clear from table 4.3.12 that the ‘t’ value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 0.96, 0.34 and 0.63 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 2 is 43.38 and the mean score of group 1, group 3 are 42.80 and 43.05 respectively. No significant difference exists between attitude towards educational process and all the three groups. Hence, attitude of teacher trainees towards educational process does not depend on socio-economic status.

Pupils

It is clear from table 4.3.12 that the ‘t’ value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.23, 0.37 and 0.86 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 2 is 45.47 and the mean score of group 1, group 3 are 44.48 and 44.84 respectively. Therefore the attitude of teacher trainees towards pupils does not depend on socio-economic status.
Teachers

It is clear from table 4.3.12 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.53, 0.71 and 0.48 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of group 2 is 42.46 and the mean score of group 1, group 3 are 41.64 and 42.18 respectively. So it can be interpreted that attitude of teacher trainees towards teachers does not depend on socio-economic status.

Overall Teaching Attitude

It is evident from table 4.3.12 that the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 1 and 3, group 2 and 3 are 1.27, 2.66 and 0.26 respectively out of which the 't' value for group 1 and 2, group 2 and 3 are not significant at 0.05 level of significance. But the 't' value for group 1 and 3 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The mean score of group 2 is 253.65 and the mean score of group 1, group 3 are 249.95 and 252.98 respectively. Significant difference exists between group 1 and group 3 while no significant difference exists between overall teaching attitude and rest of the groups i.e. group 1 and 2, group 2 and 3.

Therefore, from the above analysis, it is clear that there is no significant difference between all the six dimensions of teaching attitude and the three levels of socio-economic status but if we talk about overall teaching attitude there is significant difference exists between group 1 and group 3. This is higher in group 3 hence it can be concluded that teacher trainees of high socio economic groups possess more favourable teaching attitude in comparison to group 1.
So the hypothesis of the investigation that there is no significant difference on attitudes towards teaching due to their socio economic status is accepted with respect to all the dimensions of teaching attitude except overall teaching attitude.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, data is analyzed in the light of preset objectives of the study. Different statistical techniques like mean, S.D., coefficient of correlation and t-test were employed for the analysis of the data and to make interpretations crystal clear.

There is no significant correlation between overall teaching attitude and socio-economic status of all the teacher trainees.

There is no significant correlation between personal values and socio-economic status of all the teacher trainees.

Coefficient of correlation is significant and positive between social, democratic, knowledge, power values and the total teaching attitude. Coefficient of correlation is significant and negative between hedonistic, family prestige and health values and the total teaching attitude.

Female teacher trainees differ significantly from male teacher trainees with respect to their religious, aesthetic and economic value. These values are given higher weightage by female teacher trainees than by male teacher trainees. Similarly male teacher trainees differ significantly from female teacher trainees with respect to social, democratic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value. These values are given higher
weightage by male teacher trainees as compared to female teacher trainees.

The DIET teacher trainees differ significantly from B.Ed. teacher trainees with respect to their religious, aesthetic, hedonistic family prestige and health values. These values are given higher weightage by DIET teacher trainees than by B.Ed. teacher trainees. Similarly B.Ed. teacher trainees differ significantly from DIET teacher trainees in respect to social, democratic, knowledge, power values. These values are given higher weightage by B.Ed. teacher trainees as compared to DIET teacher trainees.

The teaching attitude of teacher trainees does not vary with respect to gender.

The B.Ed. teacher trainees shows favourable attitude towards teaching in comparison with DIET teacher trainees.
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