CHAPTER - V  
DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In preceding chapter investigator has presented analysis and organization of data obtained after applying the method and procedure as discussed in chapter third. Investigator would like to remind here that after collecting data it was subjected to the computation of correlation coefficients between independent and dependent variables. These computations of correlation coefficients were performed on computers. All the correlations were calculated on the groups formed on the basis of moderator variable i.e., sex, locality and type of school. Independent variable of the study is role conflict. There are three dependent variables these are professional commitment, frustration tolerance and teacher attitude. So there are six pairs formed on the basis of moderator variable. These are male-female urban-rural, and government aided school and public school. All these correlation's have been presented in chapter fourth under table 4.1 to 4.39. These pairs of correlation coefficients were further subjected to significance of the difference between correlation coefficients in reference to six dimensions of role conflict.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.1: Discussion of Correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the learner.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.1.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the learner for male teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference. Really role conflict has six dimensions pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .01 level \((r=-.1848^{**}, p<.01\) table No. 4.1). These result suggests that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner & vice-versa (high role diffusiveness conflict is associated with less commitment to the learner).

(b) Significant correlation has been found negative at .05 level \((r=-.1667^*, .05>p<.01, \) table No. 4.2) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner. It may be inferred that less role vulnerability conflict is associated with high commitment to learner & vice-versa.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .05 level \((r=-.1519^*, 0.5>p<.01, \) table No. 4.1). It may be suggested that less role marginal conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner & vice-versa.

(d) Correlation between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .01 level \((r=-.2679^{**}, p<.01, \) table No. 4.1). These result lead to infer that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the
learner & vice-versa.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the learner has been found insignificant \((r=0.0339, \ p>0.05, \text{table No. 4.1})\). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-0.0350, \ p>0.05, \text{table No. 4.1})\) role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner. It implies that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.

(g) Significant correlation has been found negative at .05 level \((r=-0.1912^*, 0.05>p<0.01, \text{table No. 4.1})\) between total role conflict and commitment to the learner. It may be inferred that less total role conflict is associated with high commitment to learner & vice-versa.

5.1.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the learner for female teachers.

In this context seven correlation coefficients were calculated in of course role conflict has six dimensionss. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimensions and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-0.1076, \ p>0.05, \text{table No.4.1})\) between role diffusiveness and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner.

(b) No significant correlation has been found \((r=-0.0686, \ p>0.05, \text{table No.4.1})\) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner.
learner. It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner.

(c) Significant correlation has been found positive at .01 level ($r = 0.1943^{**}$, $0.05 > p < 0.01$, table No. 4.1) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner. It leads to infer that better role marginal conflict result into better commitment to the learner.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner has been found insignificant ($r = -0.0114$, $p > 0.05$, table No. 4.1). It suggests that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = 0.0183$, $p > 0.05$, table No. 4.1) between role value conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.

(f) No significant correlation has been found ($r = 0.0611$, $p < 0.05$, table No. 4.1) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = 0.0515$, $p > 0.05$, table No. 4.1) between total role conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the learner.

5.1.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the learner for male and female teachers.
There are seven 't' value for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlation are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and first dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the learner on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.1). This, 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value leads to infer that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.4*, table No. 4.1). This, 't' value is for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value suggests that correlation for male and female teachers are different. Correlation for male teachers is negatively high (r=.1667*) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=-.0686). It may therefore be inferred that role vulnerability conflict is better related with commitment to the learner for male and female teachers.

(c) Third 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=3.4**, table No. 4.1). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict with commitment to the learner is significant, 't' value suggests that correlation for male and female are different correlation for male teachers is negatively low (r=-.1519*) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.1943**). It may therefore be inferred that role marginal conflict is better related with commitment to the learner for male and female teachers.
(d) Fourth 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.7**, table No. 4.1). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict with commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value suggests that correlation for male and female teachers are different correlation for male teachers is negatively high (r=-.2679**) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.0114). It may therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the learner for male and female teachers.

(e) Fifth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.1). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant, which implies that male and female teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=.1.0, table No. 4.1). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant, which implies that male and female teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.4*, table No. 4.1). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict with commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value suggests that correlation for male and female teachers are different correlation for male teachers is negatively high (r=-.1912*) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.0515). It may therefore be inferred that total role conflict is better related with commitment to the learner for male and female teachers.
5.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the society.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.2.1 Discussion of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the society for male teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant (r=-.0720, p>.05 table No.4.2). It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0469, p>.05, table No.4.2) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society.

(c) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.0123, p>.05, table No.4.2) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0287, p>.05, table
between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant ($r= .0666$, $p>.05$, table No.4.2). It implies that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the society.

(f) No significant correlation has been found ($r= -.0273$, $p>.05$, table No.4.2) between role institutional conflict and commitment to society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society.

(g) No significant correlation has been found ($r= -.0199$, $p>.05$, table No.4.2) between total role conflict and commitment to society. It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the society.

5.2.2 Discussion of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the society for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimensions and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r= -.0766$, $p>.05$, table No.4.2) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society.
(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0186$, $p>.05$, table No. 4.2) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society.

(c) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=.1382$, $p>.05$, table No.4.2) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society. It may be inferred that better role marginal conflict is associated with better commitment to the society.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0187$, $p>.01$, table No.4.2) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society.

(e) No insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.1055$, $p>.05$, table No.4.2) between role value conflict and commitment to the society. It suggested that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the society.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0270$, $p<.05$, table No.4.2) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict result and commitment to the society.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0584$, $p<.05$, table No.4.2) between total role conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict result and commitment to the society.

5.2.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of professional
commitment i.e., commitment to the society for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the society on other hand.

(a) First 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. Which suggest that male and female teachers quiet same on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7 table No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. Which suggest that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3 table, No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the learner is negatively insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers quiet same on this correlation.
(e) Fifth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that male and female teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6 table No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers quiet same on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8 table No. 4.2). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers quiet same on this correlation.

5.3: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Male and Female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the profession.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.3.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the profession for male teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference. Really role conflict has six dimensions pertaining to each to each dimension and seventh for the total.
(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant (r=-.0412, p>.05, table No.4.3). It implies that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.1152, p>.05, table No.4.3) role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession.

(c) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.0787, p>.05, table No.4.3) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession.

(d) Significant correlation has been found negative at level .01 (r=-.2656**, if p>.05, table No.4.3) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession. It may inferred that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the profession and reverse is also true.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the profession has been found significant (r=-1.1270, p<.05, table No.4.3). There is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the profession.

(f) Significant correlation has been found negative and significant at .05 level (r=-.1480*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.3) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession. It may be inferred that less role institutional conflict is associated with commitment to the profession & vice-versa.
(g) Significant correlation has been found negative and significant at .05 level (r=-.1992**, .05>p<.01, table No.4.3) between total role conflict and commitment to the profession. It may be inferred that less total role conflict is associated with commitment to the profession & vice-versa.

5.3.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the profession for female teachers.

In this context seven correlation coefficient were calculated. Infect role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant (r=-.0480, p>.05, table No.4.3). It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and with commitment to the profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0163, p>.05, table No.4.3) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession.

(c) No significant Correlation has been found (r=.1161, p>.05, table No.4.3) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0334, p>.05, table No.4.3) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role
commitment conflict and commitment to the profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant ($r=-.0396$, $p>.05$, table No.4.3). It suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the profession.

(f) No significant correlation has been found ($r=-.0447$, $p>.05$, table No.4.3) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0135$, $p>.05$, table No.4.3) between total role conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the profession.

5.3.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the profession for male and female teachers.

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the profession on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.1$, table No.4.3). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession is insignificant. Which suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(b) Second 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=1.0, table No. 4.4). This 't' value is for correlation of role vulnerability conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. Which suggests male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.0*, table No. 4.3). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value inferred that correlation for male and female teachers is negatively low (r=-.0787) compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.1161). It can therefore be inferred that role marginal conflict better related with commitment to the profession for male and female teachers.

(d) Fourth 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=3.0**, table No. 4.3). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value inferred that correlation for male and female teachers is negatively high (r=-.2656**) compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.0334). It can therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict better related with commitment to the profession for male and female teachers.

(e) Fifth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.9, table No. 4.3). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. Which suggests that male and female teacher do not differ on this correlation.
Sixth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.3). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. Which suggests that male and female teacher do not differ on this correlation.

Fourth 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No. 4.3). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value inferred that correlation for male and female teachers is negatively high (r=-.1992**) compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.0135). It can therefore be inferred that total role conflict better related with commitment to the profession for male and female teachers.

5.4: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Male and Female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under following sub headings.

5.4.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for male teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infect role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh and seventh for the total.
(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant \((r=-.0630, p>.05, \text{table No.4.4})\). It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to attainment to attaining excellence for professional action.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0615, p>.05, \text{table No.4.4})\) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(c) Significant correlation has been found negative at .05 level \((r=-.1721*, .05>p<.01, \text{table No.4.4})\) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It may be inferred that less role marginal conflict is associated with high commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found negative and significant at .05 level \((r=-.1509*, .05>p<.01, \text{table No.4.5})\). These result suggests that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action & vice versa.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0183, p>.05, \text{table No.4.4})\) between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.
(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant \((r= -0.0615, p > 0.05, \text{table No.4.4})\). It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional actions.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r= -0.1275, p > 0.05, \text{table No.4.4})\) between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

5.4.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e. commitment attaining excellence for professional action for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficient were calculated of course role conflict six dimensions naturally there are six pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r= -0.0457, p > 0.05, \text{table No.4.4})\) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found positive and significant at .05 level \((r= .1421^*, .05 > p < .01, \text{table No.4.4})\). It may be inferred that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.
(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found positive and significant at .01 level \( (r=\cdot2109^{**}, p<.01, \text{table No.4.4}) \). It may be inferred that better role marginal conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found positive and significant at .05 level \( (r=\cdot1539, p<.01) \). It may be inferred that better role commitment conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant \( (r=\cdot0927, p>.05, \text{table No.4.4}) \). It implies that there no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=\cdot0944, p>.05, \text{table No.4.4}) \) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found positive and significant at .05 level \( (r=\cdot1843^*, .05>p<.01) \). It may be inferred that better total role conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.
5.4.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment attaining excellence for professional action for male and female teachers.

There is seventh 't' value for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the attaining basic values on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=1.1, table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that correlation for male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between male and female teachers was found in significant (t=2.0*, table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that male and female teachers are different. Correlation for male teachers is negatively low (r=-.0615) as compared to their counter part female teachers (r=.1421*). It can therefore be inferred that role vulnerability conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for male and female teachers.

(c) Third 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=3.8**, table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that male
and female teachers are different. Correlation for male teachers is negatively low (\(r= -0.1721\)) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (\(r= 0.2109\)). It can therefore be inferred that role marginal conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for male and female teachers.

(d) Fourth 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (\(t=3.0\), table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that male and female teachers are different. Correlation for male teachers is negatively low (\(r= -0.1509\)) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (\(r= 0.1539\)). It can therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for male and female teachers.

(e) Fifth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (\(t=1.1\), table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. Which suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on the correlation.

(f) Fifth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (\(t=1.5\), table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. Which suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on the correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between male and female teachers was found
significant (t=3.1**, table No. 4.4). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that male and female teachers are different. Correlation for male teachers is negatively low (r=-.1275) as compared to their counter part female teachers (r=.1843*). It can therefore be inferred that total role conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for male and female teachers.

5.5: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Male and Female teachers with reference to role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.5.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for male teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0392, p>.05, table No.4.5) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found negative and significant at .05 level
(r=-.1339*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.5) It may be inferred that less role vulnerability conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic value & vice-versa.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values correlation has been found insignificant (r=-.0226, p>.05, table No.4.5). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values & vice-versa.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found negative and significant at .01 level (r=-.2601**, p<.01, table No.4.5). It may be inferred that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values & vice-versa.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0510, p>.05, table No.4.5) between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(f) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.0670, p>.05, table No.4.5) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found negative and significant (r=-.1486*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.5). It may be inferred that less total role conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values & vice-versa.

5.5.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment
In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six dimensions. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0462, p>.05, table No. 4.5) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant (r=.0117, p>.05, table No.4.5). It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(c) No significant correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found (r=.0934, p>.05, table No.4.5). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0554, p>.05, table No. 4.5) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0117, p>.05, table No.4.5) between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values. It implies that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(f) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.0160, p>.05, table
No.4.5) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0061, p>.05, table No.4.5) between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values. It implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values.

5.5.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for male and female teachers.

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the basic values on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.5). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads infer that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.5, table No. 4.5). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values insignificant. 't' value leads to infer that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(c) Third 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.5). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No.4.5). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values is significant, 't' value inferred that correlation for male teachers is negatively high (r=-.2601) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=-.0554). If can therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the basic values for male teacher as compared to female teachers.

(e) Fifth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.5). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value implies that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No.4.5). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No.4.5). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant.
't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.6: Discussion of Correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the learner.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.6.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the learner for rural teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference. Really role conflict has six dimensions pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .01 level (r = -0.1950**, p<.01 table No. 4.6). These result suggests that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner has been found insignificant (r = -0.0770, p>.05, table No. 4.6). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r = -0.0308, p>0.5 table No. 4.6) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner. It
leads to infer that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .05 level \((r=-.1426^*, .05>p<.01\) table No. 4.6). These results suggest that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the learner has been found insignificant at .05 level \((r=.0210, p>.05,\) table No. 4.6). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.0250, p>0.5\) table No. 4.6) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.0950, p>0.5\) table No. 4.6) between total role conflict and commitment to the learner. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the learner.

5.6.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the learner for urban teachers.

In this context seven correlation coefficients were calculated in of course role conflict has six dimensionss. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimensions and seventh for the total.
(a) Correlation has been found insignificant \((r=-.0996, p>.05\) table No. 4.6) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner. These results suggest that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0155, p>0.5\) table No. 4.6) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner.

(c) No significant correlation has been found \((r=.0939, p>0.5\) table No. 4.6) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner has been found insignificant \((r=-.1131, p>.05\) table No. 4.6). It suggests that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.0148, p>.05\), table No. 4.6) between role value conflict and commitment to the learner. It implies that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.

(f) No significant correlation has been found \((r=.0134, p>0.5\) table No. 4.6) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0266, p>.05\), table No. 4.6) between total role conflict and commitment to the learner. It
implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the learner.

5.6.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the learner for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' value for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlation are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and first dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the learner on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.0, table No. 4.6). This, 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.6). This, 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.6). This, 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(d) Fourth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.6). This, 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.6). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.6). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggest that rural and urban teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.6). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggest that rural and urban teacher do not differ on this correlation.

5.7 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the society.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.7.1 Discussion of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the society for rural teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant (r=-.1019, p>.05 table No.4.7). These result suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0300, p>.05, table No.4.7) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society.

(c) No significant correlation has been found (r=.0459, p>.05, table No.4.7) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant (r=.0427, p>.05, table No.4.7). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0805, p>.05, table No.4.7) between role value conflict and commitment to the society. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the society.
(f) No significant correlation has been found \((r=0.0812, p>0.05\), table No. 4.7) between role institutional conflict and commitment to society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0360, p>0.05\), table No.4.7) between total role conflict and commitment to the society. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the society.

5.7.2 Discussion of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the society for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimensions and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant \((r=-0.0487, p>0.05\), table No. 4.7). These result suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0186, p>0.05\), table No.4.7) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society.

(c) No significant correlation has been found \((r=0.1053, p>0.05\), table No.4.7) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society.
(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant (r=-0.0466, p>.05, table No.4.7). These result suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1098, p>.05, table No.4.7) between role value conflict and commitment to the society. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the society.

(f) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.0809, p<.05, table No.4.7) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0175, p>.05, table No.4.7) between total role conflict and commitment to the society. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the society.

5.7.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the society for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the society on other hand.

(a) First 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of role
diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value suggest that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4 table No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value suggest that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6 table, No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.9, table No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers quiet same on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.6 table No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers quiet same on this
correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2 table No. 4.7). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers quiet same on this correlation.

5.8: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Rural and Urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the profession.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.8.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the profession for rural teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference. Really role conflict has six dimensions pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant (r=-.0148, p>.05, table No.4.8). It implies that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0687, p>.05, table No.4.8) role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession.
No significant correlation has been found \((r=-.0245, \ p>.05, \text{ table No.4.8})\) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession.

Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0724, \ p>.05, \text{ table No.4.8})\) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession.

Significant correlation has been found negative at .05 level \((r=-.1602^*, \ .05>p<.01, \text{ table No.4.8})\) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession. It may be inferred that less role institutional conflict is associated with commitment to the profession.

Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant \((r=.0803, \ p>.05, \text{ table No.4.8})\). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the profession.

Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.1123, \ p>.05, \text{ table No.4.8})\) between total role conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the profession.

### 5.8.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the profession for urban teachers.

In this context seven correlation coefficient were calculated. Infect role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations
pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant (r=-.1018, p>.05, table No.4.8). It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0359, p>.05, table No.4.8) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession.

(c) No significant Correlation has been found (r=.0978, p>.05, table No.4.8) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession has been found significant and negative at .05 level (r=-.1541*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.8). It suggests that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the profession & vice-versa.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0746, p>.05, table No.4.8) between role value conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the profession.

(f) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.1135, p>.05, table No.4.8) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession.
(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0513$, $p>.05$, table No.4.8) between total role conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the profession.

5.8.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the profession for rural and urban teachers.

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the profession on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.9$, table No.4.8). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value leads to infer that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.3$, table No. 4.8). This 't' value is for correlation of role vulnerability conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.2$, table No. 4.8). This 't' value is for correlation of role commitment conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not
differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.8). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found significant (t=2.3*, table No. 4.8). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers are different correlation for rural school teacher is negatively high (r=-.1602) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers (r=.0746). It may therefore be inferred that role value conflict is better related with commitment to the profession for rural teachers as compared to urban teachers.

(f) Sixth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.8). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict with commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.8). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict with commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teacher do not differ on this correlation.
5.9: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Rural and Urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under following sub headings.

5.9.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for rural teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infect role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant (r=-.0318, p>.05, table No.4.9). These results suggest there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0195, p>.05, table No.4.9) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(c) No significant correlation has been found (r=-.0996, p>.05, table No.4.9) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is
no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant \((r=-.0473, p>.05, \text{table No.4.9})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0873, p>.05, \text{table No.4.9})\) between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(f) No significant correlation has been found insignificant \((r=.0700, p>.05, \text{table No.4.9})\) between role institutional conflict commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional actions.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0538, p>.05, \text{table No.4.9})\) between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

5.9.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e. commitment attaining excellence for professional action for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficient were calculated of
course role conflict six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant (r=.0148, p>.05, table No.4.9). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0742, p>.05, table No.4.9) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(c) No significant correlation has been found (r=.1083, p>.05, table No.4.9) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant (r=.0447, p>.05, table No.4.9). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1165, p>.05, table No.4.9) between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the
attaining excellence for professional action.

(f) No significant correlation has been found \((r=-0.0467, p>0.05, \text{table No.}4.9)\) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional actions.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0766, p>0.05, \text{table No.}4.9)\) between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

5.9.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for rural and urban teachers.

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the attaining basic values on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant \((t=0.4, \text{table No.} 4.9)\). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found
insignificant (t=0.9, table No. 4.9). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No. 4.9). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that rural and urban teachers are different correlation for rural teachers is negatively low (r=-.0996) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers (r=.1083). It may therefore be inferred that role marginal conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Fourth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found significant (t=0.9, table No. 4.9). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No. 4.9). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that rural and urban teachers are different correlation for rural teachers is negatively high (r=.1165) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers (r=-.0837). It may therefore be inferred that role value conflict is better related
with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(f) Sixth 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.9). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.9). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.10: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Rural and Urban teachers with reference to role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.10.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for rural teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant (r=.0717, p>.05, table
These results imply that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0944$, $p > 0.05$, table No.4.10) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic value.

(c) No significant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0124$, $p > 0.05$, table No.4.10) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic value.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found significant and negative at .05 level ($r = -0.1313^*$, $0.05 > p < 0.01$, table No.4.10). It suggests that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic value & vice-versa.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found significant and negative at .05 level ($r = -0.1425^*$, $0.05 > p < 0.01$, table No.4.10). It suggests that less role value conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values & reverse is also true.

(f) No significant correlation has been found ($r = 0.0420$, $p > 0.05$, table No.4.10) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0789$, $p > 0.05$, table No.4.10) between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values.
values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the basic value.

5.10.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six dimensions. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found significant ($r=-.1363^*$, $p>.05$, table No. 4.10). It suggests that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant ($r=-.0394$, $p>.05$, table No. 4.10). It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant ($r=.0362$, $p>.05$, table No. 4.10). It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(d) Significant correlation has been found negative at .05 level ($r=-.01788^*$, $0.05>p<.01$, table No. 4.10) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values. It implies that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values.
(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant ($r=0.0332$, $p>0.05$, table No.4.10). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(f) No significant correlation has been found ($r=-0.1155$, $p>0.05$, table No.4.10) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-0.0923$, $p>0.05$, table No.4.10) between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values.

5.10.3 **Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for rural and urban teachers.**

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the basic values on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers was found significant ($t=2.1^*$, table No.4.10). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers are different correlation for rural teachers is positively low ($r=0.0717$) as compared to their
counterpart urban teachers ($r = -0.1363$). If may therefore be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with commitment to the basic values.

(b) Second 't' value between correlation coefficients rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 0.5$, table No. 4.10). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value between correlation coefficients rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 0.5$, table No. 4.10). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value between correlation coefficients rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 0.5$, table No. 4.10). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value between correlation coefficients rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 1.7$, table No. 4.10). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between correlation coefficients rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 1.6$, table No. 4.10). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the
basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value between correlation coefficients rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.10). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.11: Discussion of Correlation coefficients and difference between
government aided and public school teachers with reference to
correlation between role conflict and first dimension of professional
commitment i.e., commitment to the learner.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.11.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and
first dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment
to the learner for government aided teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference. Really role conflict has six dimensions pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .01 level (r=-.2286**, p<.01, table No. 4.11). It may be inferred that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner & vice-versa.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0485, p>.05, table No.
4.11) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner.

(c) No significant correlation has been found (r= -0.0735, p>0.5 table No. 4.11) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner. It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .01 level (r= -0.2240**, p<0.01 table No. 4.11). It may be inferred that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r= -0.0187, p>0.05, table No. 4.11) between role value conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r= -0.0317, p>0.5 table No. 4.11) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the learner has been found negative and significant at .05 level (r= -0.1460*, .05>p<0.01 table No. 4.11). It may be inferred that less total role conflict is associated with high commitment to the learner.

5.11.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment
to the learner for public school teachers.

In this context seven correlation coefficients were calculated in order to role conflict has six dimensions. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r= -0.0340, p>0.05\) table No. 4.11) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner.

(b) No significant correlation has been found between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner \((r= -0.0341, p>0.05\) table No. 4.11). It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner has been found positive and significant at 0.05 level \((r= 0.1398, 0.05>p<0.01\) table No. 4.11). It may be inferred that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r= 0.0186, p>0.05\) table No. 4.11) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner.

(e) No significant correlation has been found between role value conflict and commitment to the learner \((r= 0.0569, p>0.05,\) table No. 4.11). It implies that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the learner.
(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.01267, p>.05\) table No. 4.11) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner.

(g) No significant correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the learner has been found \((r=.0658, p>.05\), table No. 4.11). It implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the learner.

5.11.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the learner for government aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' value for correlation coefficients between government aided and public school teachers. These correlation are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and first dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the learner on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant \((t=2.0*, \text{table No. 4.11})\). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Government aided school teachers is negatively high \((r=-.2286**)\) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers \((r=.0340)\). It may therefore, be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with commitment to the learner.
(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers has been found insignificant (t=0.02, table No. 4.11). This, 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No. 4.11). This, 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Government aided school teachers is negatively low (r=-.0735) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.1398). It may suggests that role marginal conflict is better related with commitment to the learner.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.3*, table No. 4.11). This, 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for government aided and school teachers is negatively high (r=-.2240**) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.0186). It may therefore be suggests that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the learner.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers has been found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.11). This, 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and
commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers has been found insignificant (t=1.6, table No. 4.11). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the learner is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.2*, table No. 4.11). This, 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the learner is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for government aided and school teachers is negatively high (r=-.1406*) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.0658). It may therefore be suggests that total role conflict is better related with commitment to the learner.

5.12 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between government aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the society.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.12.1 Discussion of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the society for government aided teachers.
Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society has been found significant and negative at 0.01 level \( (r=-.2309**, \ p<.01 \text{ table No.4.12}) \). It may be inferred that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the society & vice-versa.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=-.0934, \ p>.05 \text{, table No.4.12}) \) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society.

(c) No significant correlation has been found \( (r=-.0193, \ p>.05 \text{, table No.4.12}) \) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society has been found insignificant \( (r=-.1166, \ p>.05 \text{, table No.4.12}) \). It suggests that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=.1076, \ p>.05 \text{, table No.4.12}) \) between role value conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the society.

(f) No significant correlation has been found at .05 \( (r=-.1352*, \ p>.05 \text{, table No. 4.12}) \) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society.
society. It implies that less role institutional conflict is associated with high commitment to the society & vice-versa.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.1092$, $p>.05$, table No.4.12) between total role conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the society.

5.12.2 Discussion of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment to the society for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six dimensions. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0832$, $p>.05$, table No. 4.12) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society.

(b) No significant correlation has been found ($r=.0794$, $p>.05$, table No.4.12) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the society has been found positive and significant at .05 level ($r=.1652^*$, $0.05>p<.01$, table No.4.12). It may be inferred that better role marginal conflict is associated with better commitment to the society.
(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1134, p>.05, table No.4.12) between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society. It suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the society.

(e) No significant correlation has been found (r=.0952, p>.05, table No.4.12) between role value conflict and commitment to the society. It implies that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the society.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and commitment to the society has been found positive and significant at .05 level (r=.1739*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.12). It may be inferred that better role institutional conflict is associated with better commitment to the society.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the society has been found positive and significant at .05 level (r=.1739*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.12). It may be inferred that better total role conflict is associated with better commitment to the society.

5.12.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the society for government aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the society on other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided
and public school teachers was found significant (t=3.1**, table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the society is significant. 't' value suggest that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Govt. aided school teachers is negatively high (r=-.2309**) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher (r=.0832). It may therefore be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with commitment to the society.

(b) Second 't' value correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.7 table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.0*, table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the society is significant. 't' value suggests that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Govt. aided school teachers is negatively low (r=-.0193) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher (r=1652*). It may therefore be inferred that role marginal conflict is better related with commitment to the society.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.3*, table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and
commitment to the society is significant. 't' value suggest that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Govt. aided school teachers is negatively high (r=-.1166) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher (r=.1134). It may therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the society.

(e) Fifth 't' value correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.0, table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the society is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that government aided and public school teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=3.1**, table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the society is significant. 't' value suggests that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Govt. aided school teachers is negatively low (r=-.1352*) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher (r=.1739*). It may therefore be inferred that role institutional conflict is better related with commitment to the society.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.8*, table No. 4.12). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the society is significant. 't' value suggests that correlation for government aided and public school teachers are different correlation for Govt. aided school teachers is negatively low
(r=-.1092) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher
(r=.1739*). It may therefore be inferred that total role conflict is
better related with commitment to the society.

5.13: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between
Government aided and Public school teachers with reference to
correlation between role conflict and third dimension of professional
commitment, i.e., commitment to the profession.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented
under the following sub headings.

5.13.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and
third dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment
to the profession for government aided school teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated in this reference.
Really role conflict has six dimensions pertaining to each dimension and
seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to
the profession has been found negative and significant at .05 level
(r=-.1623*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.13). These results suggest that
better role diffusiveness conflict is associated with better commitment
to the profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0134, p>.05, table
No.4.13) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the
profession. It leads to inferred that there is no relationship between
role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the
profession has been found insignificant \((r=-.0232, \ p>.05, \ table \ No.4.13)\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession has been found negative and significant at .05 level \((r=-.1314^*, \ .05>p<.01, \ table \ No.4.13)\). These results suggest that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the profession & vice-versa.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0140, \ p>.05, \ table \ No.4.13)\) between role value conflict and commitment to the profession. It leads to inferred that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the profession.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession has been found negative and significant at .01 level \((r=-.2255^*, \ p<.01, \ table \ No.4.13)\). These results suggest that less role institutional conflict is associated with high commitment to the profession & vice-versa.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.1302, \ p>.05, \ table \ No.4.13)\) between total role conflict and commitment to the profession. It leads to inferred that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the profession.

5.13.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the profession for public school teachers.

In this context seven correlation coefficient were calculated. Infect role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations
pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant \((r=.0846, p>.05, \text{table No.4.13})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.1143, p>.05, \text{table No.4.13})\) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the profession.

(c) No significant correlation has been found \((r=.0821, p>.05, \text{table No.4.13})\) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the profession.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession has been found insignificant \((r=-.0572, .05> p>.01, \text{table No.4.13})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the profession.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.1188, p>.05, \text{table No.4.13})\) between role value conflict and commitment to the profession. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the profession.

(f) No significant correlation has been found \((r=.0805, p>.05, \text{table No.4.13})\) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession.
(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0247$, $p>.05$, table No.4.13) between total role conflict and commitment to the profession. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the profession.

5.13.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of professional commitment i.e., commitment to the profession for government aided and public school teachers.

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficients between government aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the profession on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value between correlation coefficient government aided and public school teachers was found significant ($t=2.4^*$, table No.4.13). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively high ($r=-.1623^*$) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher ($r=.0846$). It may, therefore, be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with commitment to the profession.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.0$, table No. 4.13). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.0, table No. 4.13). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.13). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.13). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value between correlation coefficient government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=3.1**, table No.4.13). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the profession is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively high (r=-.2255) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher (r=.0805). It may, therefore, be inferred that role institutional conflict is better related with commitment to the profession.
(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.13). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict with commitment to the profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.14: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Government aided and Public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under following sub headings.

5.14.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action for government aided teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infect role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found negative and significant at .05 level (r=-.1417*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.14). These result suggest that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action & vice-versa.
(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=-.0905, p>.05, \text{table No.4.14}) \) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found negative and significant at .05 level \( (r=-.1611^*, .05>p<.01, \text{table No.4.14}) \). These result suggest that less role marginal conflict is associated with commitment to attainment to attaining excellence for professional action & vice-versa.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found negative and significant at .05 level \( (r=-.1732^*, .05>p<.01, \text{table No.4.14}) \). These results suggest that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to attainment to attaining excellence for professional action & vice-versa.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found insignificant \( (r=-.0109, p<.05, \text{table No.4.14}) \). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found negative and significant at .01 level \( (r=-.1842^{**}, p<.01, \text{table No.4.14}) \). These
results suggest that less role institutional conflict is associated with high commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found negative and significant at .01 level ($r=-.1824**$, $p<.01$, table No.4.14). These results suggest that less total role conflict is associated with high commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

5.14.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment, i.e. commitment attaining excellence for professional action for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficient were calculated of course role conflict six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) No significant correlation has been found ($r=.1234$, $p>.05$, table No.4.14) between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It may implies that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(b) Significant correlation has been found positively at .05 level ($r=.1540^*$, $.05>p<.01$, table No.4.14) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It may be suggested that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the
attaining excellence for professional action has been found positively at .05 level (r=.1417*, .05>p<.01 table No.4.14). These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found significant positively at .05 level (r=.1606*, .05>p<.01 table No.4.14). It may be suggested that better role commitment conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0655, p>.05, table No.4.14) between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It may be suggested that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(f) Significant correlation has been found positively at .01 level (r=.2600**, p<.01, table No.4.14) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action. It may be suggested that better role institutional conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action has been found significant positively at .01 level (r=.2158**, p<.01 table No.4.14). It may be suggested that better total role conflict is associated with better commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.
5.14.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of professional commitment i.e. commitment attaining excellence for professional action for government aided and public school teachers.

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficients between government aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the attaining basic values on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.6*, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively high (r=−.1417) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=+.1234). It may therefore be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.4*, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively low (r=−.0905) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=+.1540*). It may therefore be inferred that role vulnerability conflict is better related with
commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant ($t=3.0^{**}$, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively high ($r=-.1611^*$) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers ($r=.1417^*$). It may therefore be inferred that role marginal conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant ($t=3.3^{**}$, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively high ($r=-.1732^*$) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers ($r=.1606^*$). It may therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.9$, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided
and public school teachers was found significant (t=4.4*, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively high (r=\-.1842**) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.2600**). It may therefore be inferred that role institutional conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=4.1**, table No. 4.14). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action is significant. 't' value leads to infer that correlation for government aided school teachers is negatively low (r=\-.1824*) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.2158*). It may therefore be inferred that total role conflict is better related with commitment to the attaining excellence for professional action.

5.15: Discussion of correlation coefficients and differences between Government aided and Public school teachers with reference to role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.15.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for government aided school teachers.
Seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found negative and significant ($r = -0.1531^*$, .05>$p<$01, table No.4.15). These results imply that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0873$, $p > .05$, table No.4.15) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic value.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant ($r = 0.127$, $p > .05$, table No.4.15). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic value.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found significant and negative at .01 level ($r = -0.2572^{**}$, $p < .01$, table No.4.15). These results suggest that less role commitment conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values & vice-versa.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0307$, $p > .05$, table No.4.15) between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and commitment to the
basic values has been found insignificant (r=-.1259, p>.05, table No.4.15). These result suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found negative and significant (r=-.1427*, .05>p<.01, table No.4.15). These result implies that less total role conflict is associated with high commitment to the basic values.

5.15.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensionss. Naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant (r=.0610, p>.05, table No.4.15). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0469, p>.05, table No.4.15) between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(c) No significance correlation has been found (r=.0325, p>.05, table No.4.15) between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values.
(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values has been found insignificant \((r=-.0516, p>.05, \text{table No. 4.15})\). These result suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.1020, p>.05, \text{table No.4.15})\) between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(f) No significant correlation has been found \((r=.0459, p>.05, \text{table No.4.15})\) between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0335, p>.05, \text{table No.4.15})\) between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and commitment to the basic values.

5.15.3 **Significance of the difference of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of professional commitment, i.e., commitment to the basic values for government aided and public school teachers.**

There are seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and commitment to the basic values on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant \((t=2.1^*, \text{table...})\)
No.4.15). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and commitment to the basic values is significant, 't' value suggests that correlation for government aided teacher is negatively high (r=\(-0.1531\)*) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=\(-0.0610\)). It may therefore be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with commitment to the basic values.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.15). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.15). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No.4.15). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and commitment to the basic values is significant, 't' value suggests that correlation for government aided teacher is negatively high (r=\(-0.2572\)**) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=\(-0.0516\)). It may therefore be inferred that role commitment conflict is better related with commitment to the basic values.
(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.15). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.8, table No. 4.15). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and commitment to the basic values is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.15). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and commitment to the basic value is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.16 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance i.e., sum of attempts.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.16.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for male teachers.
Seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In this reference naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation has been found positive and significant at .05 level ($r=.1484^*, .05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.16) between role diffusiveness conflict and some of the attempt. These results suggest that better role diffusiveness conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0982$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.16) between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempt. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict sum of the attempt.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts has been found positive and significant at .05 level ($r=.1604^*$, $.05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.16). These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts has been found positive and significant at .05 level ($r=.1481^*$, $.05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.16). These results suggest that better role commitment conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0662$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.16) between role value conflict and sum of the attempt. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempt.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and sum of the
attempts has been found insignificant \((r=0.1248, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.16})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempt.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the attempts has been found positive and significant at .01 level \((r=0.1841^{**}, p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.16})\). These results suggest that better total role conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

5.16.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant \((r=-0.1138, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.16})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempt.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-0.0476, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.16})\) between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempt. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict sum of the attempt.

(c) No significance correlation has been found \((r=0.0910, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.16})\) between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempt. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempt.
(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant \((r=0.0528, \ p>0.05, \ \text{Table No. 4.16})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0925, \ p>0.05, \ \text{Table No. 4.16})\) between role value conflict and sum of the attempt. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempt.

(f) No significance correlation has been found \((r=-0.0554, \ p>0.05, \ \text{Table No. 4.16})\) between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempt. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempt.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0169, \ p>0.05, \ \text{Table No. 4.16})\) between total role conflict and sum of the attempt. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the attempt.

5.16.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found significant \((t=2.6**, \ \text{table No. 4.16})\). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the
attempts is significant. 't' value leads to inferred that correlation for male and female teachers are different correlation for male teacher is positively high ($r=-.1484^*$) as compared to their counter part female teachers ($r=-.1138$). It may therefore be inferred that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with sum of the attempt.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.5$, table No. 4.16). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.7$, table No. 4.16). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.0$, table No. 4.16). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.2$, table No. 4.16). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female
teachers was found insignificant (t=1.8, table No. 4.16). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.6, table No. 4.16). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.17 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance i.e., sum of the time.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.17.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of time for male teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time has been found positive and significant at .01 level (r=.2409**, p<.01, Table No. 4.17). These result suggest that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time
has been found positive and significant at .05 level (r=.1567*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.17). These results suggest that less role vulnerability conflict as associated with sum of the time.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and sum of the time has been found positive and significant at .05 level (r=.1763*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.17). These results suggest that less role marginal conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0662, p>.05, Table No. 4.17) between role commitment conflict and sum of the time. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the time.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant (r=.0444, p>.05, Table No. 4.17). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the time.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and sum of the time has been found positive and significant at .05 level (r=.1428*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.17). These results suggest that less role institutional conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the time has been found positive and significant at .01 level (r=.1994**, p<.01, Table No. 4.17). These results suggest that less total role conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

5.17.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for female teachers.
In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time has been found negative and significant at .05 level \( (r=-.1579^*, \ .05>p<.01, \text{ Table No. 4.17}) \). These results suggest that less role diffusiveness conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant \( (r=-.1268, \ p>.05, \text{ Table No. 4.16}) \). It leads that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=.1137, \ p>.05, \text{ Table No. 4.17}) \) between role marginal conflict and sum of the time. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempt.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant \( (r=.0192, \ p>.05, \text{ Table No. 4.17}) \). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the time.

(e) No significant correlation has been found \( (r=.0870, \ p>.05, \text{ Table No. 4.17}) \) between role value conflict and sum of the time. It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the time.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=-.0190, \ p>.05, \text{ Table No. 4.17}) \) between role institutional conflict and sum of the time. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional
conflict and sum of the time.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant ($r=-.0106$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.17). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the time.

5.17.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found significant ($t=4.0**$, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is positively high ($r=.2409**$) as compared to their counterpart female teachers ($r=-.1579*$). It may be suggest that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with sum of the time.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found significant ($t=2.9**$, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is positively high ($r=.1567*$) as compared to their counterpart female teachers ($r=-.1268$). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with sum of the time.
(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.6, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found significant (t=2.1*, table No. 4.17). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and sum of the time is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is positively high (r=.1994**) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=-.0106). It may be suggested that total role conflict is better
related with sum of the time.

5.18 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance i.e., sum of attempt.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.18.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for rural teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0487, p>.05, Table No. 4.18) between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempt.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant (r=.0680, p>.05, Table No. 4.18). It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempt.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts has been found positive and significant at .01 level (r=.2520**, p<.01, Table No. 4.18). These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found between role commitment
conflict and sum of the attempts ($r=0.0828$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.18). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt.

(e) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=0.1575^*$, $.05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.18) between role value conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that better role value conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.1095$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.18) between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempt. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempt.

(g) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=0.1577^*$, $.05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.18) between total role conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that better total role conflict is associated with better sum of the attempt.

5.18.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0181$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.18) between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempt. It suggests that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempt.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the
attempts has been found insignificant \((r=-.0132, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.18})\). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempt.

(c) No significant relationship has been found \((r=.0196, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.18})\) between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempt.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts \((r=.1064, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.18})\). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant \((r=-.0130, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.18})\). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempt.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts \((r=.0526, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.18})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempt.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant \((r=.0427, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.18})\). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the attempt.

5.18.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for rural and urban teachers.
There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found significant (t=2.4*, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts is significant. 't' value implies that correlation for rural teachers is positively high (r=.2520, table No. 4.18) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers (r=.0196). It may therefore be suggested that role marginal conflict is better related with sum of the attempt.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban
teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.7, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.18). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.19 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance i.e., sum of the time.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.19.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of the time for rural teachers.

Seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In this reference
naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of time has been found insignificant \( (r=0.0797, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.19}) \). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time \( (r=-0.0446, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.19}) \). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time.

(c) No significance correlation has been found \( (r=0.1296, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.19}) \) between role marginal conflict and sum of the time. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the time.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant \( (r=0.0175, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.19}) \). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the time.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found \( (r=0.0133, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.19}) \) between role value conflict and sum of the time. These result suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the time.

(f) No significant correlation has been found \( (r=0.0240, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.19}) \) between role institutional conflict and sum of the time. It suggests that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the time.
Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0438, p>.05, Table No. 4.19) between total role conflict and sum of the time. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the time.

5.19.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of time for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0570, p>.05, Table No. 4.19) between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant (r=.0895, p>.05, Table No. 4.19). It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict sum of the time.

(c) Significance and positive correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and sum of the time at .05 level (r=.1517*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.19). It suggests that better role marginal conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and sum of the time (r=.0646, p>.05, Table No. 4.19). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the time.
Correlation between role value conflict and sum of the time has been found significant and positive at .05 level ($r=.1325^*$, \( .05 > p < .01 \), Table No. 4.19). These results suggest that less role value conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

Correlation between role institutional conflict and sum of the time has been found insignificant ($r=.0992$, \( p>.05 \), Table No. 4.19). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the time.

Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the time has been found significant and positive at .05 level ($r=.1443^*$, \( .05 > p < .01 \), Table No. 4.19). These results suggest that less total role conflict is associated with high sum of the time.

*5.19.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of time for rural and urban teachers.*

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of the attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.19). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value leads to inferred that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.19). This 't'
value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.19). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.19). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.19). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.19). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.19). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and sum of the time is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not
differ on this correlation.

5.20 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between Govt. aided and Public School teachers with reference to role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance i.e., sum of attempt.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.20.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for Govt. aided teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant (r=-.0133, p>.05, Table No. 4.20). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0523, p>.05, Table No. 4.20) between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts at .05 level (r=.1389*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.20). It leads to infer that better role marginal conflict is associated with better sum of the attempts.
(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=\cdot.0196, p>.05$, Table No. 4.20) between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant ($r=.1186, p>.05$, Table No. 4.20). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempts.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0332, p>.05$, Table No. 4.20) between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0632, p>.05$, Table No. 4.20) between total role conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the attempt.

5.20.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0387, p>.05$, Table No. 4.20) between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts.
(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant ($r=-.0239$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.19). It leads to infer that there is no relationship role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts ($r=.0837$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.20). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts.

(d) Significant and positive correlation has been found ($r=.1785^*$, $0.05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.20) between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts. These results suggest that better role commitment conflict is associated with better sum of the attempts.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant ($r=-.0131$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.20). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempts.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0689$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.20) between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant ($r=.0846$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.20). It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the attempts.

5.20.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of frustration
tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for Govt. aided and public school.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between Govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that for Govt. aided teachers and public school teacher do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that for Govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that Govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.0*, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts is significant. 't' value suggests that for Govt.
aided school teacher is negatively low (r = -0.0196) as compared to their counterpart public school teacher (r = 0.1785*). It may be suggest that role commitment conflict is better related with sum of the attempt.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t = 1.3, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that Govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t = 1.0, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that Govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between Govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t = 0.3, table No. 4.20). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that Govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.21 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between government aided and public school teachers with reference to role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance i.e., sum of attempt.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.21.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for government aided teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant ($r=-.1140$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.21). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.1063$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.1217$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts. It suggests that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0120$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempt.

(e) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0419$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role value conflict and sum of the attempt. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempt.
Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0623$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts. It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts.

Correlation between total role conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant ($r=-0.1073$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.21). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the attempts.

5.21.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-0.0132$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-0.0980$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.21) between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=0.1438^*$, $.05>p<0.01$, Table No. 4.21) between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts.
attempts.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts (r=0.0210, p>0.05, Table No. 4.21). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and sum of the attempts has been found insignificant (r=0.0539, p>0.05, Table No. 4.21). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and sum of the attempts.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=0.0147, p>0.05, Table No. 4.21) between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts.

(g) No significant correlation has been found between total role conflict and sum of the attempts (r=0.0375, p>0.05, Table No. 4.21). It implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict and sum of the attempts.

5.21.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of frustration tolerance, i.e., sum of attempts for government aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between government aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.
(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=2.1**, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and sum of the attempts is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high (r=.1063*) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=-.0980). It may be suggest that role vulnerability conflict is better related with sum of the attempts.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.21). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and sum of the attempts is insignificant. 't' value suggests that government aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.22 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.22.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for male teachers.
In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.0125, p>.05, Table No. 4.22). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0575, p>.05, Table No. 4.22) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0310, p>.05, Table No. 4.22) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0232, p>.05, Table No. 4.22) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.0442, p>.05, Table No. 4.22). These results suggest that there is no relationship
between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(f) Significant and negative correlation has been found at .05 level (r=-.1575*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.22) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that less role institutional conflict is associated with high attitude towards teaching profession & vice-versa.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0142, p>.05, Table No. 4.22) between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

5.22.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0487, p>.05, Table No. 4.22) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1396*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.22) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results
suggest that there is less role vulnerability conflict is associated with high attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession \((r=.0743, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.22})\). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession \((r=-.0365, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.22})\). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant \((r=.0753, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.22})\). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0192, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.22})\) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant \((r=.0507, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.22})\). It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

5.22.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude
i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that
male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Six 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.22). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.23 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.23.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for male teachers.
In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Indeed role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=.0283, p>.05, Table No. 4.23). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1264, p>.05, Table No. 4.23) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. It suggests that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found .05 level (r=.1503*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.23) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0150, p>.05, Table No. 4.23) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=.0598, p>.05, Table No. 4.23). These results suggest that there is no relationship
between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0169$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.23) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant ($r=0.0969$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.23). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

5.23.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0104$, $p>0.05$, Table No. 4.23) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level ($r=0.1878\**, p<0.01$, Table No. 4.23) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results
suggest that better between role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=0.1444, .05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.23) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice ($r=0.0489, p>.05$, Table No. 4.23). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant ($r=0.0765, p>.05$, Table No. 4.23). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0426, p>.05$, Table No. 4.23) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant ($r=0.1267, p>.05$, Table No. 4.23). It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.
5.23.3 Significant of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.23). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.23). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.23). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.23). This 't'
value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.23). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.23). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.23). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.24 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.24.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils.
In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant ($r=.0354$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.24). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(b) Significant and negative correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=-.1438^*$, $0.05>p<0.01$ Table No. 4.24) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils. These result suggest that less role vulnerability conflict is associated with high attitude towards pupils & vice-versa.

(c) Significant and negative correlation has been found .05 level ($r=-.1579^*$, $0.05>p<0.01$, Table No. 4.24) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that less role marginal conflict is associated with high attitude towards pupils & vice-versa.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0921$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.24) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(e) Significant correlation has been found .05 level ($r=.1516^*$, $0.05>p<0.01$, Table No. 4.24) between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils. These result suggest that less role value conflict is associated with high attitude towards pupils & vice-versa.
Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1079, p>.05, Table No. 4.24) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils.

Significant correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1586*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.24) between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that less total role conflict is associated with high attitude towards pupils & vice-versa.

5.24.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0859, p>.05, Table No. 4.24) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1534*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.24) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with high attitude towards pupils.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils (r=.0784, p>.05, Table No. 4.24). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal
conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils \( (r=0.0733, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.24}) \). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant \( (r=0.0618, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.24}) \). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(f) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level \( (r=0.1588^*, 0.05>p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.24}) \) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils. It leads to infer that better role institutional conflict is associated with better attitude towards pupils.

(g) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level \( (r=0.1461^*, 0.05>p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.24}) \) between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils. It leads to infer that better total role conflict is associated with better attitude towards pupils.

5.24.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female
teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.24). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.9**, table No. 4.24). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teacher is negatively low (r=—.1438*) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.1534*). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.4*, table No. 4.24). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively low (r=—.1579*) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.0784). It may be suggested that role marginal conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.6, table No. 4.24). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.1*, table No.
4.24). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively low \(r = 0.1516^*\) as compared to their counterpart female teachers \(r = 0.0618\). It may be suggested that role value conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant \(t = 2.7^{**}\), table No. 4.24). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is positively low \(r = 0.1079\) as compared to their counterpart female teachers \(r = 0.1588^*\). It may be suggested that role institutional conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant \(t = 3.1^{**}\), table No. 4.24). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards pupils is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is positively high \(r = 0.1586^*\) as compared to their counterpart female teachers \(r = 0.1461^*\). It may be suggested that total role conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

5.25 **Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching.**

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.25.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for male teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant ($r= -.0480, p > .05$, Table No. 4.25). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r= .0857, p > .05$, Table No. 4.25) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level ($r= .1399*, .05 > p < .01$, Table No. 4.25) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These result suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

(d) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level ($r= .1415*, .05 > p < .01$, Table No. 4.25) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that less role commitment conflict is associated with high attitude towards classroom teaching & vice versa.
(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant \((r=0.1065, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.25})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0427, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.25})\) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant \((r=0.1225, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.25})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

5.25.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.1010, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.25})\) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(b) No significant correlation has been found between role
vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching 
\( r = 1.261, p > .05 \), Table No. 4.25). It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching \( r = 0.0180, p > .05 \), Table No. 4.25). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching \( r = 0.0690, p > .05 \), Table No. 4.25). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant \( r = 0.0708, p > .05 \), Table No. 4.25). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(f) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \( r = 1.361^*, .05 > p < .01 \), Table No. 4.25) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that better role institutional conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching \( r = 1.211, p > .05 \), Table No. 4.25). It implies that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.
5.25.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards classroom teaching on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.5, table No. 4.25). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.25). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.25). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.25). This 't'
value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.25). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.0, table No. 4.25). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found positive and significant (t=2.4**, table No. 4.25). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively high (r=-.1225 as counterpart female teacher r=-.1211). It may be suggested that total role conflict is better related with attitude towards classroom teaching.

5.26 **Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process.**

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.26.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for male teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Significance and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1484*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.26) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1030, p>.05, Table No. 4.26) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0679, p>.05, Table No. 4.26) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0335, p>.05, Table No. 4.26) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.
Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant (r=-.1065, p>.05, Table No. 4.26). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process.

Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0166, p>.05, Table No. 4.26) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process.

Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant (r=-.0312, p>.05, Table No. 4.26). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process.

5.26.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0175, p>.05, Table No. 4.26) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process.
(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1539*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.26) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards educational process.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process (r=.0588, p>.05, Table No. 4.26). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process (r=.0661, p>.05, Table No. 4.26). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(e) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level (r=.2131**, p<.01, Table No. 4.26) between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that better role value conflict is associated with better attitude towards educational process.

(f) No significant correlation has been found between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process (r=.0132, p>.05, Table No. 4.26). It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(g) No significant correlation has been found between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process (r=.1322, p>.05, Table No. 4.26). It implies that there is no relationship between
total role conflict and attitude towards educational process.

5.26.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards educational process on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.5**, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively low (r=-.1030) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.1539*). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards educational process.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and
female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=3.2**, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards educational process is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively low (r=-.1065) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.2131**). It may be suggested that role value conflict is better related with attitude towards educational process.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant (t=1.6, table No. 4.26). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.27 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between male and female teachers with reference to correlation between
role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.27.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for male teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1102, p>.05, Table No. 4.27) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0476, p>.05, Table No. 4.27) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0796, p>.05, Table No. 4.27) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0147, p>.05, Table No. 4.27) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between
role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant \((r=0.0254, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.27})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(f) Significant and negative correlation has been found at .05 level \((r=-0.1355^*, 0.05>p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.27})\) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that less role institutional conflict is associated with high attitude towards teachers & vice-versa.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant \((r=-0.0316, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.27})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers.

5.27.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for female teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-0.0856, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.27})\) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level
(r=.1714*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.27) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards teachers.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1438*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.27) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards teachers.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers (r=.0117, p>.05, Table No. 4.27). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(e) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1367*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.27) between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that better role value conflict is associated with better attitude towards teachers.

(f) No significant correlation has been found between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers (r=.0810, p>.05, Table No. 4.27). It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1196, p>.05, Table No. 4.27) between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers.
5.27.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for male and female teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between male and female teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards teacher on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found positive and significant (t=2.0*, table No. 4.27). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is positively high (r=.1102) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=-.0856). It may be suggested that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with attitude towards teachers.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.2*, table No. 4.27). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively low (r=-.0476*) as compared to their counterpart female teachers (r=.1714*). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards teachers.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.2*, table No. 4.27). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and
attitude towards teachers is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively low \((r=-0.0796^*)\) as compared to their counterpart female teachers \((r=0.1438^*)\). It may be suggested that role marginal conflict is better related with attitude towards teachers.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant \((t=0.2, \text{table No. } 4.27)\). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant \((t=1.0, \text{table No. } 4.27)\). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found negative and significant \((t=2.1^*, \text{table No. } 4.27)\). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers is significant. 't' value suggests that for male teachers is negatively high \((r=-0.1355^*)\) as compared to their counterpart female teachers \((r=0.0810)\). It may be suggested that role institutional conflict is better related with attitude towards teachers.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between male and female teachers was found insignificant \((t=1.5, \text{table No. } 4.27)\). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude
towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that male and female teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.28 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.28.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for rural teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.0652, p>.05, Table No. 4.28). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(b) Significant correlation has been found .01 level (r=.2102**, p<.01, Table No. 4.28) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0626, p>.05, Table No.
4.28) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0256, p>.05, Table No. 4.28) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.1055, p>.05, Table No. 4.28). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.1230, p>.05, Table No. 4.28) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.0919, p>.05, Table No. 4.28). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

5.28.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards
teaching profession for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0743$, $p > 0.05$, Table No. 4.28) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r = -0.0110$, $p > 0.05$, Table No. 4.28) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession ($r = 0.0566$, $p > 0.05$, Table No. 4.28). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession ($r = -0.0418$, $p > 0.05$, Table No. 4.28). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant ($r = 0.0132$, $p > 0.05$, Table No. 4.28). It suggests that there is no relationship between
role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0243$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.28) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant ($r=-.0184$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.28). It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

5.28.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards teaching profession on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.4$, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant ($t=2.2^*$, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability
conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is significant. 't' value suggests that for rural teachers is positively high ($r=0.2102^{**}$) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers ($r=-0.0110$). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.1$, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.7$, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.1$, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.4$, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban
teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.28). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.29 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.29.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for rural teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=.0921, p>.05, Table No. 4.29). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(b) Significant correlation has been found at .01 level (r=.2738**, p<.01, Table No. 4.29) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.
(c) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1777*, 0.05>p<.01, Table No. 4.29) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0333, p>.05, Table No. 4.29) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(e) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1412*, 0.05>p<.01, Table No. 4.29) between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that better role value conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0297, p>.05, Table No. 4.29) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(g) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1741*, 0.05>p<.01, Table No. 4.29) between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that better total role conflict is associated with better attitude towards child centered practice.
5.29.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0470$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.29) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0417$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.29) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.1266$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.29) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice ($r=.0456$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.29). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.
(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=-.0114, p>.05, Table No. 4.29). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0805, p>.05, Table No. 4.29) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=.0615, p>.05, Table No. 4.29). It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

5.29.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards child centered practice on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No. 4.29). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found significant \((t=2.4^*, \text{table No. 4.28})\). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and child centered practice is significant. 't' value suggests that for rural teachers is positively high \((r=0.2738^{**})\) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers \((r=0.0417)\). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with child centered practice.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant \((t=0.5, \text{table No. 4.29})\). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant \((t=0.2, \text{table No. 4.29})\). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant \((t=1.5, \text{table No. 4.29})\). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant \((t=1.1, \text{table No. 4.29})\). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests
that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.1$, table No. 4.29). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.30 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.30.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for rural teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant ($r=.0549$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0673$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between
role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant ($r=-.0902$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.1185$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant ($r=-.0556$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0378$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant ($r=-.0844$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils.

5.30.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated.
Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant (r=.0616, p>.05, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0923, p>.05, Table No. 4.30) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant (r=.0146, p>.05, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0865, p>.05, Table No. 4.30) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant (r=-.0292, p>.05, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0996, p>.05, Table No. 4.30) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils.
Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant ($r = 0.0705$, $p > 0.05$, Table No. 4.30). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils.

5.30.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards pupil on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 0.1$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 1.6$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t = 1.0$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found negative and significant ($t=2.1^*$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for rural teachers is negatively high ($r=-.1185$) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers ($r=.0865$). It may be suggested that role commitment conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=0.3$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.4$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant ($t=1.5$, table No. 4.30). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.31 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching.
Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.31.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for rural teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0501, p>.05, Table No. 4.31) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(b) No significant correlation has been found between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching (r=.0540, p>.05, Table No. 4.31). It implies that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching (r=.0134, p>.05, Table No. 4.31). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching (r=.0662, p>.05, Table No. 4.31). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards
classroom teaching.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant (r=.1120, p>.05, Table No. 4.31). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(f) No significant correlation has been found between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching (r=.0324, p>.05, Table 4.31). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching (r=.0841, p>.05, Table 4.31). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

5.31.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact, role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant (r=-.0244, p>.05, Table No. 4.31). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.
(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \(r=.1514^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.31}\) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \(r=.1363^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.31}\) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

(d) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \(r=.1432^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.31}\) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that better role commitment conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant \(r=.0543, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.31}\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(f) Significant correlation has been found at .05 level \(r=.1413^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.31}\) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that better role institutional conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

(g) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \(r=.1490^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.31}\) between total role conflict
and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that better total role conflict is associated with better attitude towards classroom teaching.

5.31.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards classroom teaching on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.0, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.6, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.5, table No. 4.31). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.32 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.32.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for rural teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant (r=.0196, p>.05, Table No. 4.32). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0117, p>.05, Table No. 4.32) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0160, p>.05, Table No. 4.32) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(d) Significant correlation has been found (r=-.1333*, p>.05, Table No. 4.32) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that less role vulnerability conflict is associated with high attitude towards educational process & vice-versa.
Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant \((r=.0120, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.32})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process.

Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-0.0469, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.32})\) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process.

Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant \((r=-0.0462, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.32})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process.

5.32.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \((r=0.1393^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.32})\) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that better role diffusiveness conflict is associated with better attitude towards educational process.
(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=0.0869, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.32})\) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process \((r=0.0286, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.32})\). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(d) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level \((r=0.1998^{**}, p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.32})\) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that better role commitment conflict is associated with better attitude towards educational process.

(e) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \((r=0.1528^*, p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.32})\) between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that better role value conflict is associated with better attitude towards educational process.

(f) No significant correlation has been found between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process \((r=0.0346, p>0.05, \text{Table No. 4.32})\). It implies that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(g) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \((r=0.1580^*, p<0.01, \text{Table No. 4.32})\) between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that
better total role conflict is associated with better attitude towards educational process.

5.32.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for rural and urban teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and sum of attempts on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.0, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban
teachers was found negative and significant (t=3.4**, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process is significant. 't' value suggests that for rural teachers is negatively low (r=-.1333*) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers (r=.1998**). It may be suggested that role commitment conflict is better related with attitude towards educational process.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.1*, table No. 4.32). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards educational process is significant. 't' value suggests that for rural teachers is negatively low (r=-.0462) as compared to their counterpart urban teachers (r=.1580*). It may be suggested that total role conflict is better related with attitude towards educational process.

5.33 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between rural and urban teachers with reference to correlation between
role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.33.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for rural teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0116, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0818, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0840, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0191, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between
role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant (r=.0121, p>.05, Table No. 4.33). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant (r=-.0880, p>.05, Table No. 4.33). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0206, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers.

5.3.3.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for urban teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0315, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0359, p>.05, Table No. 4.33) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.
teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0312$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.33) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0259$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.33) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant ($r=.1183$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.33). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant ($r=.0524$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.33). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0483$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.33) between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers.

5.33.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for rural and urban teachers.
There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between rural and urban teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards teachers on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.33). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.33). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No. 4.33). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.1, table No. 4.33). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.33). This 't'
value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No. 4.33). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between rural and urban teachers was found insignificant (t=0.3, table No. 4.33). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that rural and urban teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.34 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between govt. aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.34.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for govt. aided school teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.
(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant ($r=-.0909$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.34). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant ($r=-.0762$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.34). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=.0406$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.34) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0186$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.34) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant ($r=.1062$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.34). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=-.0829$, $p>.05$, Table
No. 4.34) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.0175, p>.05, Table No. 4.34). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

5.34.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant (r=.0555, p>.05, Table No. 4.34). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1457*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.34) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that better role vulnerability conflict is associated with better attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0940, p>.05, Table No.
4.34) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0388, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.34})\) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant \((r=-.0397, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.34})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0619, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.34})\) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession has been found insignificant \((r=.0585, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.34})\). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession.

5.34.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and first dimension of teacher attitude
i.e., attitude towards teaching profession for govt. aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards teaching profession on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.5, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.3*, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is negatively low (r=-.0762) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.1457). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards teaching profession.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ
on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards teaching profession is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.
5.35 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between govt. aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.35.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for govt. aided school teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=.0703, p>.05, Table No. 4.35). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1772*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level (r=.2212**, p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and
attitude towards child centered practice.

(d) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level (r=.1908**, p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(e) Significant and positive correlation has been found .05 level (r=.1620*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0536, p>.05, Table No. 4.35) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(g) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level (r=.2191**, p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

5.35.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and
seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0403, p>.05, \text{Table No. } 4.35)\) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \((r=.1362*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. } 4.35)\) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.0832, p>.05, \text{Table No. } 4.35)\) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(d) No significant correlation has been found between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice \((r=-.1338, p>.05, \text{Table No. } 4.35)\). It implies that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant \((r=-.0178, p>.05, \text{Table No. } 4.35)\). It suggests that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0163, p>.05, \text{Table } \)
No. 4.35) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice. It leads to infer that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice has been found insignificant (r=.0108, p>.05, Table No. 4.35). It suggests that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice.

### 5.35.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and second dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards child centered practice for govt. aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards child centered practice on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.1, table No. 4.35). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.35). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value
suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.4, table No. 4.35). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found significant (t=3.2**, table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high (r=.1908**) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=-.1338). It may be suggested that role commitment conflict is better related with attitude towards child centered practice.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.8, table No. 4.35). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Six 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.7, table No. 4.35). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and
attitude towards child centered practice is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation between govt. aided and public school teacher was found significant (t=2.1* table No. 4.34). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards child centered practice is significant 't' value suggests that for govt. aided school teachers is positively high (r=.2191**) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.0108). It maybe suggested that total role conflict is better related with attitude towards child centered practice.

5.36 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between govt. aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.36.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for govt. aided school teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant (r=.1306, p>.05, Table No. 4.36). These results suggest that there is no relationship
between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1009, p>.05, Table No. 4.36) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(c) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1655*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that better role marginal conflict is associated with better attitude towards pupils.

(d) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1375*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that better role commitment conflict is associated with better attitude towards pupils.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant (r=.0705, p>.05, Table No. 4.36). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(f) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level (r=.1785*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(g) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level (r=.1895**, p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between total role conflict and
attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils.

5.36.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils has been found insignificant (r=.0109, p>.05, Table No. 4.36). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.1035, p>.05, Table No. 4.36) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(c) Significant and negative correlation has been found at .01 level (r=-.2289**, p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.1298, p>.05, Table No. 4.36) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupils.
(e) Significant and negative correlation has been found at .05 level (r=-.1668*, .05>p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.1219, p>.05, Table No. 4.36) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupils.

(g) Significant and negative correlation has been found at .01 level (r=-.1926**, p<.01, Table No. 4.35) between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards pupils.

5.36.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and third dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards pupils for govt. aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards pupils on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.36). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards pupils is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.
(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant \((t = 2.0^*, \text{table No. } 4.36)\). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high \((r = .1009)\) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers \((r = -.1035)\). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant \((t = 4.0^{**}, \text{table No. } 4.36)\). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high \((r = .1655^*)\) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers \((r = -.2289^{**})\). It may be suggested that role marginal conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant \((t = 2.7^{**}, \text{table No. } 4.36)\). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high \((r = .1375^*)\) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers \((r = -.1298)\). It may be suggested that role commitment conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant
(t=2.4*, table No. 4.36). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high (r=.0705) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=-.1668). It may be suggested that role value conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant (t=3.0**, table No. 4.36). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high (r=.1785*) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=-.1219). It may be suggested that role institutional conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant (t=3.8**, table No. 4.36). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards pupil is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively low (r=.1895**) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=-.1926**). It may be suggested that total role conflict is better related with attitude towards pupils.

5.37 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between govt. aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching.
Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.37.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for govt. aided school teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant (r=-.0784, p>.05, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(b) Correlation between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant (r=.0686, p>.05, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) Correlation between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant (r=.0791, p>.05, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(d) Correlation between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant (r=.0907, p>.05, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship
between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant ($r=0.0487$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant ($r=0.0691$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching has been found insignificant ($r=0.0739$, $p>.05$, Table No. 4.37). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

### 5.37.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level ($r=0.1490^*$, $.05>p<.01$, Table No. 4.37) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness
conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(b) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \( (r=1.555^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.37}) \) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) No significant correlation has been found between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching \( (r=0.0807, p>.05, \text{Table No. 4.37}) \). It implies that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(d) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \( (r=1.500^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.37}) \) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(e) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \( (r=1.494^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.37}) \) between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(f) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .05 level \( (r=1.449^*, .05>p<.01, \text{Table No. 4.37}) \) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

(g) Significant and positive correlation has been found at .01 level
(r=.2044**, p<.01, Table No. 4.37) between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching.

5.37.3 **Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and fourth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards classroom teaching for govt. aided and public school teachers.**

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards classroom teaching on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.3*, table No. 4.37). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is negatively low (r=-.0784) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=.1490*). It may be suggested that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with attitude towards classroom teaching.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant (t=2.3*, table No. 4.37). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is
positively low \((r=.0686)\) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers \((r=.1555^*)\). It may be suggested that role vulnerability conflict is better related with attitude towards classroom teaching.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant \((t=.01, \text{table No. 4.37})\). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant \((t=.06, \text{table No. 4.37})\). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant \((t=1.0, \text{table No. 4.37})\). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant \((t=0.7, \text{table No. 4.37})\). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value
suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.37). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards classroom teaching is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.38 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between govt. aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.

5.38.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for govt. aided school teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant (r=.1061, p>.05, Table No. 4.38). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process.
(b) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0092, p>0.05$, Table No. 4.38) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0656, p>0.05$, Table No. 4.38) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.1100, p>0.05$, Table No. 4.38) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant ($r=0.0879, p>0.05$, Table No. 4.38). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found ($r=0.0099, p>0.05$, Table No. 4.38) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards
educational process has been found insignificant \((r=.0908, p>.05,\) Table No. 4.38). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process.

5.38.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Correlation between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant \((r=.1105, p>.05,\) Table No. 4.38). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.1120, p>.05,\) Table No. 4.38) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=-.0630, p>.05,\) Table No. 4.38) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found \((r=.0312, p>.05,\) Table No. 4.38).
4.38) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant (r=.0513, p>.05, Table No. 4.38). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(f) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0453, p>.05, Table No. 4.38) between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process.

(g) Correlation between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process has been found insignificant (r=.0660, p>.05, Table No. 4.38). These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards educational process.

5.38.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and fifth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards educational process for govt. aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude
towards educational process on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found negative and significant (t=2.2*, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards educational process is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is negatively low (r= -.1061) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r= .1105). It may be suggest that role diffusiveness conflict is better related with attitude towards educational process.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.3, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ
on this correlation.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.4, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.2, table No. 4.38). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards educational process is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

5.39 Discussion of correlation coefficients and difference between govt. aided and public school teachers with reference to correlation between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers.

Discussion of the result under this main heading shall be presented under the following sub headings.
5.39.1 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for govt. aided school teachers.

In the context seven correlation coefficients were calculated. Infact role conflict has six dimensions naturally there are six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

(a) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1083, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(b) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0883, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(c) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0911, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1084, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant (r=.1081, p>.05, Table No. 4.39). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers.
Correlation between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant (r=.0303, p>.05, Table No. 4.39). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers.

Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.1320, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers.

5.39.2 Discussion of correlation coefficients between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for public school teachers.

In this reference seven correlation coefficients were calculated. In fact role conflict has six correlations pertaining to each dimension and seventh for the total.

Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0598, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers.

Insignificant correlation has been found (r=.0355, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers.

Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0280, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers.
(d) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.1066, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between role commitment conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(e) Correlation between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant (r=.0275, p>.05, Table No. 4.39). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role value conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(f) Correlation between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers has been found insignificant (r=-.0632, p>.05, Table No. 4.39). These results suggest that there is no relationship between role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers.

(g) Insignificant correlation has been found (r=-.0458, p>.05, Table No. 4.39) between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers. These results suggest that there is no relationship between total role conflict and attitude towards teachers.

5.39.3 Significance of the difference of correlation coefficient between role conflict and sixth dimension of teacher attitude i.e., attitude towards teachers for govt. aided and public school teachers.

There are seven 't' values for correlation coefficients between govt. aided and public school teachers. These correlations are between six dimensions of role conflict and total role conflict on one hand and attitude towards teachers on the other hand.

(a) First 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.6, table No.
This 't' value for correlation of role diffusiveness conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(b) Second 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.5, table No. 4.39). This 't' value for correlation of role vulnerability conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(c) Third 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.2, table No. 4.39). This 't' value for correlation of role marginal conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(d) Fourth 't' value for correlation coefficient between government aided and public school teachers was found positive and significant (t=2.2*, table No. 4.39). This 't' value for correlation of role commitment conflict and attitude towards teacher is significant. 't' value suggests that for government aided teachers is positively high (r=.1084) as compared to their counterpart public school teachers (r=-.1066). It may be suggested that role commitment conflict is better related with attitude towards teacher.

(e) Fifth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.8, table No.
4.39). This 't' value for correlation of role value conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(f) Sixth 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=0.9, table No. 4.39). This 't' value for correlation of role institutional conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.

(g) Seventh 't' value for correlation coefficient between govt. aided and public school teachers was found insignificant (t=1.8, table No. 4.39). This 't' value for correlation of total role conflict and attitude towards teachers is insignificant. 't' value suggests that govt. aided and public school teachers do not differ on this correlation.