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CHAPTER-4

ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

“When data has been obtained, it is necessary to organize them for the interpretation. Qualitative data may have to be summarized and treated statistically to make significant clean.”

- Olive R.A.G.

According to, Good, Bar and Scates, “Analysis is a process which enters into research in one form or another, from the very beginning. It may be fair to say that research, in general, consists of two large steps i.e. gathering of data and the analysis of research data”.

The data may be adequate, valid and reliable to any extent but the success of any research work depends more upon the fact that how reasonably collected data have been analyzed. Only collection is meaningless until we reach to a factual conclusion by analysing them through systematic method and interpret them based on the objectives. Hence in this chapter, the data gathered so far has been analyzed through proper statistical techniques and results have been interpreted.

In the previous chapters, description of the problem, review of related literature, description of tools and procedure for data collection has been presented. It is already stated that the purpose of this study is to study critically the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of teachers working at higher secondary schools. In the present study job satisfaction and teaching attitude of higher secondary school teachers comprise the dependent variables whereas, sex and working place (rural and urban) comprise the independent variables.

The present chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. In accordance with the objectives of the present study, the data
were tabulated, analysed statistically then interpretation has been given accordingly and facts have also been presented through graphical representation.

4.1.0 ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 4.1

A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Male Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SE_M</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Urban School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81.34</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82.47</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis (H₀₁) which states that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban male teachers and rural male teachers was calculated and it was not found to be significant even at 0.01 level. It indicates that the job satisfaction between urban and rural male teachers is not significantly different.

It means the first hypothesis (H₀₁) is accepted and its first aspect related to sex is not affecting the job satisfaction.
A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of urban and rural school male teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.1

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Male Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.2

A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Urban Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEₘ</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81.34</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(df = 248)

The first hypothesis (H₀₁) which asserts that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban male teachers and urban female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It points out that the job satisfaction between urban male and female teachers is significantly different.

It reveals that the first hypothesis (H₀₁) rejected and it is concluded that its second aspect, related to sex is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of urban school male and female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.2

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Urban Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation

![Graphical representation of job satisfaction](image-url)
The first hypothesis ($H_{01}$) which affirms that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban male teachers and rural female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It implies that the job satisfaction between urban male and rural female teachers is significantly different.

It means the first hypothesis ($H_{01}$) is rejected and it is disclosed that its third aspect, related to sex is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of urban male and rural female teachers is also presented in the following figure.

### Table 4.3

**A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81.34</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance level is 0.05 and 0.01.
Figure 4.3

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
### Table 4.4

**A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Rural Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers**

[df = 248]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SE&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82.47</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis (H<sub>01</sub>) which comments that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between rural male teachers and urban female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It shows that the job satisfaction between rural male and urban female teachers is significantly different.

It reveals that the first hypothesis (H<sub>01</sub>) is rejected and it is summarized that its fourth aspect, related to sex is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of rural male and urban female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.4

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Rural Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation

![Graph showing mean and standard deviation for job satisfaction of rural school male teachers and urban school female teachers]
Table 4.5
A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Rural Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SE_M</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82.47</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>64.88</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis (H₀₁) which states that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between rural male teachers and rural female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It denotes that the job satisfaction between rural male and female teachers is significantly different.

It shows that the first hypothesis (H₀₁) is rejected and it is disclosed that its fifth aspect, related to sex is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of rural male and female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.5

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Rural Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
### Table 4.6

**A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Urban Female Teachers and Rural Female Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>64.88</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis (H\(_0\)1) which asserts that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban female teachers and rural female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the job satisfaction between urban female and rural female teachers is significantly different.

It reveals that the first hypothesis (H\(_0\)1) is rejected and it is disclosed that its sixth aspect, related to sex is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of urban and rural female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.6
A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Urban Female Teachers and Rural Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation.
Table 4.7

A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Male Teachers and Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SE_M</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All the Male Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>81.91</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All the Female Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>71.24</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis ($H_01$) which says that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly, the ‘t’ test between all the male teachers and all the female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the job satisfaction between all the male and female teachers is significantly different.

It means the first hypothesis ($H_01$) is rejected and it is concluded that sex is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of male and female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.7

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Male Teachers and Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.8

A Comparative Study of the Job Satisfaction of Urban Teachers and Rural Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>79.47</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>73.63</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second hypothesis \(H_02\) which says that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place. Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban teachers and rural teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the job satisfaction between urban and rural teachers is significantly different.

It shows that the second hypothesis \(H_02\) is rejected and it is concluded that working place (urban or rural) is affecting the job satisfaction.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of job satisfaction of urban and rural teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.8

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Job Satisfaction of Urban Teachers and Rural Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.9
A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Male Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEMP</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>286.49</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>278.52</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis (H₀�) which states that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban male teachers and rural male teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It implies that the teaching attitude between urban and rural male teachers is significantly different.

It reveals that the third hypothesis (H₀�) is rejected and its first aspect, related to sex is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of urban and rural male teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.9

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Male Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.10

A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Urban Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers

(df = 248)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SE_m</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>286.49</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>282.36</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis (H_0^3) which asserts that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban male teachers and urban female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the teaching attitude between urban male and female teachers is significantly different.

It means that the third hypothesis (H_0^3) is rejected and it is disclosed that its second aspect, related to sex is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of urban male and female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.10

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Urban Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
## Table 4.11

**A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SE_M</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>286.49</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>260.96</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis ($H_{03}$) which states that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban male teachers and rural female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It points out that the teaching attitude between urban male and rural female teachers is significantly different.

It shows that the third hypothesis ($H_{03}$) is rejected and its third aspect, related to sex is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of urban male and rural female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.11

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Urban Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation

![Bar chart showing mean and standard deviation of teaching attitude for urban male teachers and rural female teachers. The mean for urban male teachers is 286.49 with a standard deviation of 21.35, and for rural female teachers is 260.96 with a standard deviation of 19.54.]
Table 4.12
A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Rural Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.E.M</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>278.52</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>282.36</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[\text{df} = 248]

The third hypothesis (\(H_03\)) which affirms that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between rural male teachers and urban female teachers was calculated and it was not found to be significant even at 0.01 level.

It shows that the teaching attitude between rural male and urban female teachers is not significantly different.

It means that the third hypothesis (\(H_03\)) is accepted and its fourth aspect, related to sex is not affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of rural male and urban female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.12

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Rural Male Teachers and Urban Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.13

A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Rural Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>278.52</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>260.96</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis \( H_0^3 \) which says that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between rural male teachers and rural female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It implies that the teaching attitude between rural male and female teachers is significantly different.

It reveals that the third hypothesis \( H_0^3 \) is rejected and its fifth aspect, related to sex is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of rural male and female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.13

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Rural Male Teachers and Rural Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.14

A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Urban Female Teachers and Rural Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>282.36</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>260.96</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis (H₃) which comments that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the‘t’ test between urban female teachers and rural female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It denotes that the teaching attitude between urban and rural female teachers is significantly different.

It means that the third hypothesis (H₃) is rejected and its sixth aspect, related to sex is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD score of teaching attitude of urban female and rural female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.14

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Urban Female Teachers and Rural Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.15

A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Male Teachers and Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All the Male Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>282.51</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All the Female Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>271.66</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third hypothesis (H03) which states that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

Accordingly the ‘t’ test between all the male teachers and all the female teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It points out that the teaching attitude between all the male teachers and female teachers is significantly different.

It reveals that the third hypothesis (H03) is rejected and it is concluded that sex is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of male and female teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.15

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Male and Female Teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
Table 4.16
A Comparative Study of the Teaching Attitude of Urban Teachers and Rural Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban School Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>284.42</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural School Teachers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>269.74</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth hypothesis ($H_0^4$) which asserts that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place. Accordingly the ‘t’ test between urban teachers and rural teachers was calculated and it was found to be significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that the teaching attitude between urban teachers and rural teachers is significantly different.

It means the fourth hypothesis ($H_0^4$) is rejected and it is concluded that working place (urban or rural) is affecting the teaching attitude.

A comparison between Mean and SD scores of teaching attitude of urban and rural teachers is also presented in the following figure.
Figure 4.16

A Comparative Graphical Representation of Teaching Attitude of Urban teachers and Rural teachers with Respect to Mean and Standard Deviation
The fifth hypothesis (H$_0$5) which states that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly to test null hypothesis H$_0$: $\rho = 0$ against H$_1$: $\rho \neq 0$ the calculated t = 14.41 showing rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence H$_0$: $\rho = 0$ is rejected and we conclude that there exists positive correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of urban schools male teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to higher and higher teaching attitude in them.
Table 4.18

A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Urban Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( \sigma_r )</th>
<th>Calculated ( t ) value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban School Female Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth hypothesis (H\(_5\)) which asserts that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly to test null hypothesis H\(_0\) \( \rho = 0 \) against H\(_1\) \( \rho \neq 0 \) the calculated \( t = 4.27 \) indicating rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore H\(_0\) \( \rho = 0 \) is rejected and we infer that there exists positive correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of urban schools female teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to higher and higher teaching attitude in them.
### Table 4.19

**A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Rural Male Teachers**

Table value of Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.01</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>(\sigma)</th>
<th>Calculated 't' value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Male Teachers</td>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth hypothesis (\(H_0\)5) which asserts that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly to test null hypothesis \(H_0\): \(\rho = 0\) against \(H_1\): \(\rho \neq 0\) the calculated \(t = 0.73\) indicating rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence \(H_0\): \(\rho = 0\) is rejected and we sum up that there exists negative correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of rural schools male teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to lower and lower teaching attitude in them.
Table 4.20

A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Rural Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>σᵣ</th>
<th>Calculated ‘t’ value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural School Female Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth hypothesis (H₀₅) which states that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly to test null hypothesis H₀: ρ = 0 against H₁: ρ ≠ 0 the calculated t = 4.10 showing rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore H₀: ρ = 0 is rejected and we conclude that there exists positive correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of rural schools female teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to higher and higher teaching attitude in them.
**Table 4.21**

A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Male Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Calculated ‘t’ value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the Male Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth hypothesis \( H_0 \) which asserts that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly to test null hypothesis \( H_0: \rho = 0 \) against \( H_1: \rho \neq 0 \) the calculated \( t = 1.42 \) indicating rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence \( H_0: \rho = 0 \) is rejected and we infer that there exists negative correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of all the male teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to lower and lower teaching attitude in them.
Table 4.22

A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( \sigma_r )</th>
<th>Calculated ‘t’ value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the Female Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth hypothesis \( H_0 \) which states that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex. Accordingly to test null hypothesis \( H_0: \rho = 0 \) against \( H_1: \rho \neq 0 \) the calculated \( t = 9.84 \) showing rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence \( H_0: \rho = 0 \) is rejected and we sum up that there exists positive correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of all the female teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to higher and higher teaching attitude in them.
Table 4.23

A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Urban Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>Calculated ‘t’ value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the Urban Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixth hypothesis ($H_06$) which states, that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place. Accordingly to test null hypothesis $H_0$: $\rho = 0$ against $H_1$: $\rho \neq 0$ the calculated $t = 11.50$ showing rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence $H_0$: $\rho = 0$ is rejected and we infer that there exists positive correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of all the urban teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to higher and higher teaching attitude in them.
### Table 4.24

**A Study of Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Teaching Attitude of Rural Teachers**

[\text{df} = 248]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Calculated 't' value</th>
<th>Table value of Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the Rural Teachers</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixth hypothesis (H\(_6\)) which states, that there is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place. Accordingly to test null hypothesis H\(_0\): \( \rho = 0 \) against H\(_1\): \( \rho \neq 0 \) the calculated t = 1.26 indicating rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence H\(_0\): \( \rho = 0 \) is rejected and we sum up that there exists negative correlation between “job satisfaction” and “teaching attitude” of all the rural teachers. It means more and more job satisfaction would lead to lower and lower teaching attitude in them.
4.2.0 OBTAINED RESULTS

4.2.1 Results Related to the First hypothesis (H₀₁)

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

(1) **Table 4.1** shows that the calculated t-value (0.93) is lesser than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 level of significance. So H₀₁ is accepted. Hence it can be said that there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction level of urban and rural male teachers.

(2) **Table 4.2** shows that the calculated t-value (3.33) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 level of significance. So H₀₁ is rejected, it means there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of urban male teachers and urban female teachers. From the same table it can also be seen that the mean score of urban male teachers (81.34) is greater than that of the urban female teachers (77.6). Thus it can be inferred that the job satisfaction level of urban male teachers is higher than urban female teachers.

(3) It is observed from the **table 4.3** that the calculated t-value (14.13) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 significant level. So, H₀₁ is rejected. Thus, implying that there exists a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of urban male and rural female teachers. Also, the mean score of urban male teachers (81.34) is greater than that of the rural female teachers (64.8). It means the level of job satisfaction of urban male teachers is higher than rural female teachers.
(4) **Table 4.4** reveals that the obtained t-value (4.27) is greater than the table t-value (2.59) at 0.01 significant level. So, $H_0:1$ is rejected. It can therefore be said that there exists a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of rural male teachers and urban female teachers. Besides, the mean score of rural male teachers (82.47) is greater than the mean score of urban female teachers (77.6). Hence, rural male teachers have significantly higher level of job satisfaction as compared to urban female teachers.

(5) **Table 4.5** shows that the calculated t-value (15.99) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 significant level. Hence $H_0:1$ is rejected. It means there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of rural male and rural female teachers. Besides, the mean score of rural male teachers (82.47) is greater than the mean score of rural female teachers (64.88). Thus it can be said that the job satisfaction level of rural male teachers is higher than their female counterparts.

(6) It is clear from the **table 4.6** that the obtained t-value (12.84) is greater than the table t-value at 0.01 significant level. Therefore, $H_0:1$ is rejected. This means that there exists a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of urban female teachers and rural female teachers. Also the mean score of urban female teachers (77.6) is higher than that of rural female teachers (64.88). So, urban female teachers have significantly higher level of job satisfaction than rural female teachers.

(7) **Table 4.7** shows that the calculated t-value (12.12) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 level of significance. Hence $H_0:1$ is rejected.
It means there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of male and female teachers. Also, the mean score of male teachers (81.91) is greater than that of female teachers (71.24). Thus, it can be inferred that the job satisfaction level of male teachers is higher than female teachers.

On the basis of the above results hypothesis $H_01$ is rejected, it means there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction of teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

4.2.2 Results Related to the Second Hypothesis ($H_02$)

$H_02$: There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place.

(8) It is observed from the table 4.8 that the calculated t-value (6.02) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 significant level. Hence, $H_02$ is rejected, which means there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of urban and rural teachers. From the same table it is also observed that the mean score of urban teachers (79.47) is greater than the mean score of rural teachers (73.63). It means, job satisfaction level of urban teachers is higher than the job satisfaction level of rural teachers.

On the basis of the above result hypothesis $H_02$ is rejected. It means there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction of teachers working at higher secondary school on the basis of their working place.
4.2.3 Results Related to the Third Hypothesis (H_{03})

**H_{03}:** There is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

(9) **Table 4.9** shows that the calculated t-value (2.73) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 level of significance. So, H_{03} is rejected. It indicates that there is a significant difference in the teaching attitude of urban male and rural male teachers. From the same table we see that the mean score of urban male teachers (286.49) is greater than the mean score of rural male teachers (278.52). This reveals that the teaching attitude of urban male teachers is more favourable than their rural counterparts.

(10) **Table 4.10** shows that the calculated t-value (1.50) is less than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 significant level. So, H_{03} is accepted. It means there is no significant difference in the teaching attitude of urban male and female teachers.

(11) It is evident from the **table 4.11** that the obtained t-value (9.89) is greater than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 significant level. It shows significant difference in the teaching attitude of urban male and rural female teachers. So H_{03} is rejected. Besides, the mean score of urban male teachers (286.49) is greater than rural female teachers (260.96). It means teaching attitude of urban male teachers is more favourable than the rural female teachers.
(12) It is clear from the table 4.12 that the calculated t-value (1.30) is less than the tabulated t-value at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, $H_0$ is accepted. Hence, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the teaching attitude of rural male and urban female teachers.

(13) Table 4.13 exhibits that the obtained t-value (6.2) is greater than the tabulated t-value (2.59) at 0.01 level of significance. So, $H_0$ is rejected. It indicates that there is a significant difference in the teaching attitude of rural male and rural female teachers. Further, the mean score of rural male teachers (278.52) is greater than rural female teachers (260.96). It means teaching attitude of rural male teachers is more favourable than the rural female teachers.

(14) Table 4.14 shows that the calculated t-value (8.0) is greater than the tabulated t-value (2.59) at 0.01 level of significance. So, $H_0$ is rejected. It implies that there is a significant difference in the teaching attitude of urban and rural female teachers. Besides urban female teachers scored higher mean value (282.36) than rural female teachers (260.96). It means teaching attitude of urban female teachers is more favourable than the teaching attitude of rural female teachers.

(15) Table 4.15 shows that the calculated t-value (5.18) is greater than the tabulated t-value (2.59) at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, $H_0$ is rejected. Hence, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the teaching attitude of male and female teachers. Further, the mean score of male teachers (282.51) is greater than the mean score of female
teachers (271.66). So, it can be inferred that the teaching attitude of male teachers is more favourable than the teaching attitude of female teachers.

On the basis of the above results $H_03$ is rejected. It means there is a significant difference between the teaching attitude of teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

4.2.4 Results Related to the Fourth Hypothesis ($H_04$)

$H_04$: There is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of working place.

(16) It is obvious from the table 4.16 that the calculated t-value (7.17) is greater than the tabulated t-value (2.58) at 0.01 level of significance. So $H_04$ is rejected. It means there is a significant difference in the teaching attitude of urban and rural teachers. Besides, the mean score of urban teachers (284.42) is greater than that of rural teachers (269.74). Hence, it can be said that the urban teachers have more favourable teaching attitude than rural teachers.

On the basis of the above result $H_04$ is rejected. It means there is a significant difference between the teaching attitude of teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of working place.

4.2.5 Results Related to the Fifth Hypothesis ($H_05$)

$H_05$: There is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place.
Table 4.17 exhibits that the calculated t-value is 14.41, that is showing rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \rho = 0$ against $H_1: \rho \neq 0$. It means there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban male teachers. From the same table it can be seen that the r-value is 0.80, which implies a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban male teachers.

Therefore, it can be inferred that a significantly positive correlation is found between the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban male teachers.

Table 4.18 shows that the calculated t-value is 4.27, which is showing rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \rho = 0$ against $H_1: \rho \neq 0$. It means there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban female teachers. Further, the ‘r’ value is 0.36 that shows a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban female teachers.

Hence, it can be concluded that a significantly positive correlation is found between the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban female teachers.

Table 4.19 reveals that the calculated t-value is 0.73, which shows the rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \rho = 0$ against $H_1: \rho \neq 0$. So, it can be said that there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural male teachers. Besides, the r-value (-0.06), implies a negative correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural male teachers.
Hence, it can be inferred that a significantly negative correlation is found between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural male teachers.

(20) It is observed from the table 4.20 that calculated t-value is 4.10 and it indicates the rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \rho = 0$ against $H_1: \rho \neq 0$. It means there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural female teachers.

Further, the r-value (0.33) in the table showing a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural female teachers.

So, it is concluded that a significantly positive correlation is found between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural female teachers.

(21) It is obvious from table 4.21 that calculated t-value (1.42) is showing rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \rho = 0$ against $H_1: \rho \neq 0$. Hence, there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of male teachers. Besides, the r-value (-0.09), implies a negative correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of male teachers.

Therefore, it can be summarized that a significantly negative correlation is found between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of male teachers.

(22) It is clear from the table 4.22 that the calculated t-value is 9.84, which is showing the rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \rho = 0$ against $H_1: \rho \neq 0$. It means there exists a significant correlation between job
satisfaction and teaching attitude of female teachers. Further, the r-value (0.53) in the table showing a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of female teachers.

Therefore, it can be said that a significantly positive correlation is found between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of female teachers.

On the basis of the above results $H_0$5 is rejected. It means there is a significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their sex.

4.2.6 Results Related to the Sixth Hypothesis ($H_0$6)

$H_0$6: There is no significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place.

(23) It is evident from the table 4.23 that the calculated t-value is 11.50, which shows the rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0$: $\rho = 0$ against $H_1$: $\rho \neq 0$. It means there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban teachers. Besides, the r-value (0.59), implies a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban teachers.

Hence, it can be concluded that a significantly positive correlation is found between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban teachers.

(24) It is observed from the table 4.24 that the calculated t-value (1.26) is showing rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0$: $\rho = 0$ against $H_1$: $\rho \neq 0$. It means there exists a significant correlation between job satisfaction and
teaching attitude of rural teachers. Further, the r-value (-0.08) implies a negative correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural teachers.

Therefore, it can be concluded that a significantly negative correlation is found between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural teachers.

On the basis of the above results $H_06$ is rejected. It means there is a significant correlation between the job satisfaction and the teaching attitude of the teachers working at higher secondary schools on the basis of their working place.
4.3.0 INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

1. On the basis of the conclusion, drawn from table 4.1, there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction level of urban male teachers and rural male teachers. This result seems justly because youths have changed their mindset and inclined towards teaching profession because of increasing unemployment problem. Consequently, more eligible and highly educated persons also prefer this profession and they are ready to make adjustment and work even in odd situations of rural schools with having job satisfaction. Besides, social change and infrastructure development have also bridged the gap of rural and urban schools.

2. According to the conclusion, obtained from table 4.2, the job satisfaction level of urban male teachers is higher than the job satisfaction level of urban female teachers, working at higher secondary schools. In urban areas generally we don’t find joint families so urban female teachers bear comparatively more family responsibilities. This may be the reason of their low job satisfaction. Hence, the above result is reasonable.

3. It is found after the observation of table 4.3 that the job satisfaction level of urban male teachers is higher than the rural female teachers. There may be many reasons for this like; high achievement level of urban school students, better organizational climate etc. Hence, efforts should be made to create better organizational climate to improve the achievement level of students from primary level in rural areas also for increasing job satisfaction level of rural female teachers. The researcher has given completeness to the result on the scientific base. Hence, the result is completely reliable and valid.
4. The conclusion received through the observation of table 4.4 is that the job satisfaction level of rural male teachers is higher than urban female teachers. The reason behind this is that the rural male teachers have low expectations and less pressure of participation in extracurricular activities. Hence, the urban school authority should make reasonable work balance among teachers for their higher job satisfaction level.

5. It is found after the observation of table 4.5 that the rural male teachers have higher job satisfaction level than rural female teachers. The reason for this is that rural female teachers have comparatively more domestic responsibilities. Therefore they cannot be committed completely towards teaching profession. The researcher has given completeness to the result on the scientific base. Hence, the result is completely reliable and valid.

6. On the basis of the conclusion drawn from table 4.6, it is clear that the job satisfaction level of urban female teachers is higher than rural female teachers. The reason behind this is that rural female teachers are always worried about better education for own their children, health and other facilities for their family. That is why they cannot show full commitment for the job. Hence, government should take necessary step in this direction so that better education, health and other facilities can be provided to the children and family of the rural female teachers for their better contribution. The researcher has given completeness to the result on the scientific base. So in researcher’s opinion the result is completely reliable and valid.

7. We come to know after the observation of table 4.7 that the job satisfaction level of male teachers is higher than female teachers, working at higher secondary schools. The reason of this difference is
that on the one hand where because of social changes women are receiving higher education so now they are not limited to only teaching profession and are also opting other professions. On the other hand increasing unemployment has compelled men to choose teaching profession with positive thinking. So the job satisfaction level of male teachers is higher than female teachers. This finding is supported by foreign study Ali et al. (2004) and Indian study Kaur & Sidana (2011). Hence, this study is similar to previous Indian and foreign study.

8. According to the conclusion drawn from table 4.8 the job satisfaction level of urban teachers is higher than rural teachers, working at higher secondary schools. It has many reasons like; good achievement level of students, better organizational climate, sufficient opportunities for advancement and better facilities for health & education for their children etc. Hence, government and other social organizations must make positive efforts in this direction to bridge the gap of job satisfaction level.

The researcher has not come across to any Indian study that is similar to this result but in foreign study Finely (1991) found the same result.

9. It is clear from the conclusion obtained by the observation of table 4.9 that the teaching attitude of urban male teachers is more favorable than rural male teachers. It means urban male teachers have positive attitude towards teaching profession. The reason is that the achievement level of most of the students, studying in rural schools, is low due to lack of proper educational environment. Teachers do not get facilities regarding building and equal opportunity for innovation and using technology. Therefore they cannot develop positive attitude towards teaching. Hence, in pre service trainings some activities
should be included so that teachers can use available resources and can perform better even in the lack of resources. In this way they will create positive attitude towards teaching profession. The researcher has given completeness to the result on the scientific base.

10. We know from the conclusion received through the observation of table 4.10 that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of urban male teachers and urban female teachers, working at higher secondary schools. There are many reasons behind this result such as: equal opportunity to enhance knowledge, equal opportunity for professional advancement, same organizational climate and being treated equally by the school authority without any gender discrimination. Therefore the result is reasonable.

11. It is found through the observation of table 4.11 that the teaching attitude of urban male teachers is more favorable than the teaching attitude of rural female teachers, working at higher secondary schools. Teaching and non teaching workload because of insufficient staff is the main reason behind this. Besides, rural female teachers bear the pressure of domestic responsibilities that is why they cannot develop the positive teaching attitude. Hence, it is the responsibility of the Government to recruit sufficient teachers in rural areas also. School authority should also make work balance among the teachers and create an atmosphere of co-operation and contribution so that female teachers can also develop positive teaching attitude despite all the difficulties. The researcher has given completeness to the result on the scientific base.
12. It is clear from the conclusion drawn from **table 4.12** that there is no significant difference between the teaching attitude of urban female teachers and rural male teachers. Infrastructure development has bridged the gap of urban and rural areas and social changes have made male and female equal in every aspect.

13. It is known from the conclusion received after the observation of **table 4.13** that rural male teachers have more favorable teaching attitude than rural female teachers. The main reason of this difference is that rural male teachers remain aware to maintain their level of knowledge. So they take interest and actively participate in short term and long term trainings, refresher courses, orientation programs, seminars and workshops while rural female teachers remain disinterested and avoid their participation in such programs, even when they get opportunity. Hence, government and concerned authorities should make efforts to organize such programs at their working place so that their participation can be ensured. Besides, to develop positive teaching attitude in them some innovative programs should also be organized. Hence, in researcher’s opinion this result is absolutely valid and reliable.

14. According to the conclusion, obtained by the observation of **table 4.14** the teaching attitude of urban female teachers is higher than rural female teachers. Since urban female teachers have better advancement opportunity and there is a lot of difference in their school climate, colleagues, achievement level of children. Hence, government should make efforts in this direction to decrease this difference and provide equal advancement opportunity. We come to the conclusion through the discussion that researcher has given
completeness to the result on the scientific base. Hence, in researcher’s opinion the result is completely reliable and valid.

15. It is found on the basis of the conclusion drawn from table 4.15 that the teaching attitude of male teachers is more favorable than the teaching attitude of female teachers. If we consider the reasons then we find that female teachers play a double role professional and domestic. In many times because of the difficulties of family life they cannot be committed and develop positive attitude towards teaching profession. Hence, government and management should organize capacity enhancing programs and ensure the participation of female teachers. Besides, for better contribution and participation they should be rewarded.

The researcher has not come across to any foreign study which gives similar findings but in Indian study Panda (1982) & Patnaik and Saroj Jain (2007) found more favorable attitude of male teachers than their female counterparts. Hence, this study has similar findings like earlier. So, on the basis of this the result is completely reliable and valid.

16. It is evident from the conclusion obtained after the observation of table 4.16 that teaching attitude of urban teachers is more favorable than rural teachers. This result seems reasonable. Since, in rural areas teachers bear extra workload, teaching and non teaching, because of insufficient staff. Therefore they cannot maintain and increase their level of knowledge. Sometimes they have to teach additional subjects; consequently their teaching attitude changes and they remain disinterested. While urban teachers have a desire of recognition so they keep competitive spirit among each other. In this way they automatically have more favorable teaching attitude. In foreign study
Dr. H.V. Belagali (2011) and Mohammad Iqbal Matto (2014) also found more favorable teaching attitude of urban male higher secondary school teachers than that of urban female teachers. Hence, this study has similar findings like earlier.

17. We come to know after the observation of table 4.17 that there is a significantly positive correlation between the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban male teachers. Therefore, administration and management should make efforts to maintain and increase the teaching attitude of teachers. For this they should prepare plan to organize trainings, to inspire them for innovation, to provide them better and sufficient facilities, to send them in other model schools for observing and for teaching like in internship programs and if possible, they should be given opportunity to visit and see foreign schools.

18. According to the conclusion drawn from table 4.18, there is a significantly positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban female teachers. Hence, concerned authority and administration should try to make them familiar with new teaching methods and the use of new technology for increasing their teaching attitude.

19. It is clear from the conclusion obtained after the observation of table 4.19 that there is a significantly negative correlation between the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural male teachers. Hence administration, management, school authority and social organizations will have to make collective efforts to make the correlation positive and at expected level.

20. It is evident from the conclusion obtained after the observation of table 4.20 that there is a significantly positive correlation between the teaching attitude and job satisfaction of rural female teachers. Hence,
to increase the teaching attitude of rural female teachers government and school administration should make these efforts such as: making working conditions more favorable, to recruit teachers for work balance, to organize trainings for enhancing teaching skills and to benefit them with extra incentives etc.

21. It is evident from the conclusion obtained through the observation of table 4.21 that the correlation of job satisfaction and teaching attitude of male teachers is significantly negative. This conclusion points out that, to achieve the expected positive level, many efforts should be made like; to give the recognition through awards and rewards on suitable occasions, to develop self related skills, commencement of innovative programs, to increase the job involvement, to keep them away from non teaching works and to give them special incentives etc. The researcher has not come across any foreign study with similar finding but in Indian study Sinha & Shrama (1962) and Singh (2006) found the similar correlation. Hence, this study has similar findings like earlier. So, on the basis of this the result is completely reliable and valid.

22. It is obvious from conclusion obtained after the observation of table 4.22 that there is a significantly positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching attitude of female teachers working at higher secondary schools. Since, women are traditionally inclined towards this profession therefore they have positive attitude towards teaching. Hence, efforts should be made to maintain and increase their teaching attitude for achieving educational goals. The researcher has not come across any foreign study with similar finding but in Indian study Singh (1974), Goyal (1980) and Anand (1986) supported the findings of the study.
23. It is obvious from the conclusion obtained through the observation of table 4.23 that there is a significantly positive correlation between the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of urban teachers. Hence, they should try to make better adjustment with school, colleagues and students and use technology in their teaching for increasing teaching attitude.

24. It is known through the conclusion after the observation of table 4.24 that there is significantly negative correlation between the job satisfaction and teaching attitude of rural teachers working at higher secondary schools. Hence, their jobs conditions should be made more favorable, they should be trained in such a way in which they can teach effectively even in rural areas. For this they can be sent in model schools for teaching for some time. In this way, the correlation of job satisfaction and teaching attitude can be brought at expected level.