CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

4.0 OVERVIEW

The Present Chapter deals with the Analysis of the Data. The collected data according to the procedures discussed in Chapter III was carefully processed and systematically analyzed. The appropriate statistical techniques such as Mean, Standard Deviations, ‘t’ test and Correlation Coefficient ‘r’ were properly applied to draw the conclusion rationally.

4.1 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The analysis of data is presented in the following Two Sections such as Descriptive Analysis with Five Sub-Divisions and Inferential Analysis with Eight Sub-Divisions.

4.2 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviation scores of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teacher of the Colleges with High, Low availability of ICT devices and also Government, Aided and Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Five Sub Divisions.
4.2.1 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with High Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the Table 4.1.

4.2.2 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with Low Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with Low Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the Table 4.2.

4.2.3 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Government Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Government Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the Table 4.3.

4.2.4 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Aided Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the
Student-Teachers of the Aided Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the Table 4.4.

4.2.5 **Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Self-Financing Colleges of Education**

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the Table 4.5.

4.2.6 **Classification of Colleges of Education based on the Availability of ICT Facilities**

This section deals with the analysis of the Availability of ICT facilities in Colleges of Education as collected from the ICT Availability Schedule from the respective Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the Table 4.6.

4.2.7 **High Availability Colleges of Education**

Based on the scores of the Availability of ICT facilities some of the Colleges of Education are categorized as High Availability Colleges i.e., the Colleges with the Availability of more than 65% were considered as High ICT Availability Colleges. The names of the High ICT Availability Colleges of Education are given in the Table 4.7.
4.2.8 Low Availability Colleges of Education

Based on the scores of the Availability of ICT facilities some of the Colleges of Education are categorized as Low Availability Colleges i.e., the Colleges with the of ICT devices Availability 65% and less than that is considered as the Low ICT Availability Colleges. The names of the Low ICT Availability Colleges of Education are given in the Table 4.8.

4.3 INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS

This section deals with the analysis of the Significant Difference and Relationship between Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with High, Low Availability of ICT devices, Government, Aided and Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Eight Sub Divisions.

4.3.1 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the significant difference in the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with High Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.8 to 4.17.
4.3.2 Relationship of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the significant relationship between the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with High Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Table 4.18.

4.3.3 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with Low Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the significant difference in the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with Low Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.19 to 4.28.

4.3.4 Relationship of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with Low Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the significant relationship of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with Low Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Table 4.29.

4.3.5 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices between the Colleges with Low and High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices between the Student-Teachers of the Colleges
with Low and High Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.30 to 4.39.

4.3.6 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Government Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Government Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.40 to 4.46.

4.3.7 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Aided Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Aided Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.47 to 4.53.

4.3.8 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Self-Financing Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.54 to 4.60.
4.2 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with High, Low availability of ICT devices and also among the Student-Teachers of the Government, Aided and Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Five sub divisions.

4.2.1 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Table 4.1.
Table 4.1
Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>67.72 3.82</td>
<td>60.78 7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>67.08 5.91</td>
<td>59.76 7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>67.91 3.55</td>
<td>63.42 14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>67.56 5.09</td>
<td>61.04 7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>67.69 3.62</td>
<td>61.15 13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>67.53 4.79</td>
<td>61.64 11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67.59 3.63</td>
<td>60.25 7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68.70 3.81</td>
<td>56.18 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67.76 3.47</td>
<td>58.01 7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>67.57 4.85</td>
<td>62.03 11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.79 3.81</td>
<td>62.76 7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67.34 6.33</td>
<td>60.99 7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>68.04 3.80</td>
<td>60.50 12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Degree</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>67.66 3.85</td>
<td>61.35 11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG Degree</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>67.54 5.55</td>
<td>60.34 7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>67.92 4.07</td>
<td>60.55 7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>66.69 6.35</td>
<td>59.96 7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>67.94 3.48</td>
<td>62.12 13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>67.58 4.94</td>
<td>61.39 11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67.94 3.05</td>
<td>60.90 7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.16 3.81</td>
<td>58.68 7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67.34 5.77</td>
<td>61.08 7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.81 3.66</td>
<td>61.10 6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68.10 3.69</td>
<td>59.78 7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.37 3.51</td>
<td>62.70 17.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.72</td>
<td>67.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.78</td>
<td>59.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>63.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above Table 4.1 the result reveals that the average Mean scores of Awareness is 67.78 and for Utilization it is 60.78. Further it is understood from the results that the Awareness is high 68.70 among the age group Above 30 years and their Utilization is only 56.18. Regarding Utilization it is high among Female and less among the Student-Teachers of age Above 30 years.

4.2.2 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Colleges with Low Availability of ICT Devices

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations between Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with Low Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Table 4.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>65.37</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65.06</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>65.51</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65.17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66.29</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64.35</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Degree</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>65.46</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG Degree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65.55</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.05</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is revealed from the above Table 4.2 that the average Mean scores of Awareness is 65.37 and for Utilization it is 60.18. Further it is understood from the results that the Awareness is high among the Student-Teachers of Business parents and Utilization were high among SC Student-Teachers, whereas both Awareness and Utilization were least among the Student-Teachers of Private /Other employed parents.

4.2.3 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Government Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Government Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Table 4.3.
Table 4.3
Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Government Colleges of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Awareness Mean</th>
<th>Awareness SD</th>
<th>Utilization Mean</th>
<th>Utilization SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>61.05</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69.26</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>61.86</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>68.81</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>60.14</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>61.65</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>60.13</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>75.94</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>61.02</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>61.19</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>64.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>59.56</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>69.07</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>61.12</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>61.69</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69.52</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>61.44</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69.15</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>60.65</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Degree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69.08</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>61.75</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG Degree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>61.20</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.40</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.63</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.72</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig - 6
Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Government Colleges of Education
It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.3 that the average Mean scores of Awareness is 69.05 and for Utilization it is 61.05. Further it is understood from the results that the Awareness is less among the Mathematics major Student-Teachers and Utilization were less among student- teachers of Professionally Qualified parents, whereas both Awareness and Utilization was significantly high among the Student-Teachers of age Above 30 years.

4.2.4 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Aided Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Aided Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Table 4.4.
## Table 4.4
Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the
Aided Colleges of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68.62</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>68.40</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67.54</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>68.51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Degree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG Degree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.87</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67.49</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.59</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig - 7
Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Aided Colleges of Education
On observing the above Table 4.4 it is understood that the average Mean scores of Awareness is 68.35 and for Utilization it is 62.56. Further it is understood from the results that the Awareness is high and Utilization is less among the student teachers of Age above 30 years. Further the Awareness is less and Utilization is more among SC Student-Teachers.

4.2.5 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Self-Financing Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Mean and Standard Deviations of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Table 4.5.
Table 4.5
Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Self-Financing Colleges of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>69.12</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>68.48</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68.46</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>69.22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Degree</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG Degree</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.85</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>68.99</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Self-Financing Colleges of Education

Total Male Female
Awareness 68.6 57.6 69.12
Utilization 67.58 58.81 56.98
It is understood from the above Table 4.5 that the average Mean scores of Awareness is 68.60 and for Utilization it is 57.60. Further it is understood from the results that the Awareness is less and Utilization was more among the SC Student-Teachers whereas the Awareness is more among Student-Teachers of Graduate Parents and Utilization is less among Professionally Qualified Parents.

4.2.6 Classification of Colleges of Education based on the Availability of ICT devices

The Availability of ICT facilities in Colleges of Education as collected from the Availability schedule from the respective Colleges of Education are listed in the following Table 4.6.
## Table 4.6

**Colleges of Education with the Availability of ICT devices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Name of the College</th>
<th>Mean Score of ICT (Out of 40)</th>
<th>% of ICT Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IASE Saidapet, Chennai.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>IASE Triplicane, Chennai.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Meston College of Education, Royapettai-Chennai.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>NKT College of Education, Triplicane-Chennai.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>PDRV College of Education, Harur-Dharmapuri.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Pachamuthu College of Education, Dharmapuri.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>St.Joans College of Education, Krishnagiri.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sri Vidhya Mandhir College of Education, Uthangarai.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sri Jaya Jothi College of Education, Tharamangalam, Salem.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kasthooribha Gandhi College of Education, Athanoor-Namakkal.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the scores of the Availability of ICT facilities, two types of Colleges of Education such as High and Low Availability was drawn. The list of Low and High Availability ICT Colleges of Education are listed below.
4.2.7 High ICT Availability Colleges of Education

Based on the scores of the Availability of ICT devices the following Colleges of Education are categorized as High Availability Colleges i.e., the Colleges with the Availability of more than 65% were considered as High ICT Availability Colleges.

The names of the High ICT Availability Colleges of Education are given in the Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Name of the College of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IASE Saidapet, Chennai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>IASE Triplicane, Chennai.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.8 Low ICT Availability Colleges of Education

Based on the scores of the Availability of ICT facilities the following Colleges of Education are categorized as Low Availability Colleges i.e., the Colleges with the of ICT devices Availability 65% and less than that is considered as the Low ICT Availability Colleges.

The names of the Low ICT Availability Colleges of Education are given in the following Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Name of the College of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PDRV College of Education, Harur-Dharmapuri.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS

This section deals with the analysis of the Significant Difference and the Significant Relationship in the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with High Availability, Low Availability of ICT devices, Government, Aided and Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Eight Sub Divisions.
4.3.1 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the significant difference in the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with High availability of ICT devices. This helps to find out the level of Awareness and Utilization of Information and Communication Technology among the Student-Teachers in Tamil Nadu among the Colleges with High availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.9 to 4.18.

Table 4.9
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Male-Female Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>67.08</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>2.16 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>4.17 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

The above Table 4.9 reveals that the ‘t’ value 2.16 of the average Mean scores of Awareness category and 4.17 of Utilization between the Male and Female Student-Teachers are Significant at 0.05 level. From the results it is understood that the Female Student-Teachers Mean scores are higher than
the Male Student-Teachers. It reveals that Female Student-Teachers are having more awareness towards ICT and utilizing ICTs more in their learning process.

Table 4.10

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Rural-Urban Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>67.56</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>61.04</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>61.15</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level   ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is seen from the Table 4.10 that the ‘t’ values 0.36 of average Mean scores of Awareness and 0.13 of Utilization between the Rural and Urban Student-Teachers are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the Mean scores that the Rural and Urban Student-Teachers were similar on both the Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices.
Table 4.11

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>61.64</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>1.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>2.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>4.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.18</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>61.64</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.18</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

On observing the Table 4.11 it is found that the ‘t’ values 0.12, 1.57, 1.74 and 1.61 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization are Not Significant whereas 2.97 and 4.19 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Student-Teachers of all the age groups are having similar Awareness on ICT devices. Regarding Utilization the Student-Teachers of age groups 20-25 and 26-30 years are Utilizing similarly and are more than the other age group above 30 years.
### Table 4.12

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Married-Unmarried Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>58.01</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>5.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>62.03</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the Table 4.12 that the ‘t’ value 0.52 of the average Mean scores of Awareness is Not Significant and 5.01 of Utilization is Significant at 0.05 level. From the results it is found that the Mean scores of Awareness of ICT devices were similar whereas the Utilization of the Unmarried Student-Teachers is more than the Married. Hence it is understood that Unmarried Student-Teachers utilize more ICT facilities in teaching than the Married Student-Teachers.
Table 4.13

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Community Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>68.04</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>68.04</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the Table 4.13 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 0.87, 1.51 and 0.54 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization are Not Significant and 3.13, 2.01 and 2.41 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness of the BC Student-Teachers towards ICT devices is significantly more than their counterparts whereas the Utilization is more among the SC Student-Teachers than the BC and MBC Student-Teachers.
Table 4.14

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of UG-PG qualified Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>67.66</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>67.54</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>60.34</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

The Table 4.14 reveals that the ‘t’ values 0.32 and 0.88 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization of ICTs are Not Significant among the Student-Teachers whose Basic Qualification is Under Graduate and Post Graduate degrees at 0.05 level. Hence it is understood that the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers are similar with regard to Basic Qualification.
Table 4.15
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Major Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60.55</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the Table 4.15 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 2.13, 2.62 and 2.17 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization category are Significant and 0.03, 0.60 and 1.71 are found to be Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that Arts and Science major Student-Teachers are having similar Awareness on ICT devices and are more than the Mathematics Student-Teachers. It is imbibed that Science Student-Teachers are utilizing more ICT facilities than the Mathematics and Arts major Student-Teachers.
### Table 4.16

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>61.39</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60.90</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60.90</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58.68</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>61.39</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58.68</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is seen from the Table 4.16 that the ‘t’ values 0.97, 1.39 and 0.72 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and 0.56 and 1.77 of Utilization category are Not Significant whereas 2.27 is Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the above results that the Awareness on the ICT devices are similar with respect to the Parents Education. But the Utilization of the ICT facilities is similar among the Graduates and Professionals whereas the Student-Teachers of School Educated parents are utilizing more ICT facilities than the others.
Table 4.17
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is seen from the Table 4.17 that the ‘t’ values 0.82, 1.60 and 0.05 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and 0.01, 1.69 and 1.24 of Utilization are Not Significant at 0.05 level. The result implies that the Parents Occupation does not influence the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities in teaching process among the Student-Teachers.
Table 4.18

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>1.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.18 it is seen that the ‘t’ values 0.57, 0.86 and 1.78 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and 1.32, 0.95 and 1.95 of Utilization category are Not Significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that the Parents Occupation does not make any difference on the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers.
4.3.2 Relationship between Student-Teachers Mean Scores on Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Colleges with High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the Correlation analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with High Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Table 4.19.
Table 4.19
‘r’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>‘r’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Degree</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG Degree</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Educated</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level
From the above Table 4.19 it is revealed that the ‘r’ values between the average Mean scores of Student-Teachers’ Awareness and Utilization pertaining to the variables such as Student-Teachers in Total, Sex, Locality, Age, Marital Status, Community, Basic Qualification, Major Subject, Parent’s Education and Parent’s Occupation are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that there is no relationship between the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Student-Teachers with respect to the Student-Teachers in Total, Sex, Age, Locality, Marital Status, Community, Basic Qualification, Major Subject, Parent’s Education and Parent’s Occupation.

4.3.3 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Colleges with Low Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the significant difference in the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with Low Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.20 to 4.29.
Table 4.20

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Male-Female Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65.06</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61.24</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.20 it is understood that the ‘t’ values 2.00 and 2.17 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization of the ICT facilities between the Male and Female Student-Teachers are Significant at 0.05 level. On observing the Mean scores it is inferred that the Female Student-Teachers have more Awareness than the Male Student-Teachers whereas the Male Student-Teachers Utilize more ICT facilities than the Female Student-Teachers.
Table 4.21

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Rural-Urban Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>65.51</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59.72</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is understood from the Table 4.21 that the ‘t’ values 0.96 and 0.36 of the average Mean scores on Awareness and Utilization between the Rural and Urban Student-Teachers are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is inferred from the above results that the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities among the Rural and Urban Student-Teachers were similar.
Table 4.22
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65.17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65.17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>60.54</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.54</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

On observing the Table 4.22 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 2.56 of the average Mean scores of Awareness on ICT devices is Significant and 1.82, 0.02, 1.05, 0.58 and 0.21 of the Awareness and Utilization category are Not Significant at 0.05 level. From the results it is understood that the Awareness on ICT devices are similar among 20-25 years and above 30 year’s age groups and is more among the 26-30 years age groups whereas the Utilization of ICT facilities among all the age grouped Student-Teachers were similar.
Table 4.23
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Married-Unmarried Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66.29</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

The Table 4.23 reveals that the ‘t’ value 2.11 and 2.69 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices between the Married and Unmarried student teachers are Significant at 0.05 level. It is to be noted that the Awareness on ICT devices among the Married is more but the Unmarried are utilizing more ICT facilities than the Married Student-Teachers.
From the Table 4.24 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 1.68 and 1.61 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and 0.55 of Utilization category are Not Significant and 3.56 of Awareness and 3.83 and 4.00 of Utilization category are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness of the BC Student-Teachers towards ICT devices is more whereas the Utilization of ICT facilities is more among the SC Student-Teachers than the BC and MBC Student-Teachers.
Table 4.25
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of UG-PG qualified Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>65.46</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58.48</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is seen from the Table 4.25 that the ‘t’ value 0.81 of the average Mean scores of Awareness is Not Significant and 2.65 of Utilization it is Significant between the Student-Teachers whose Basic Qualification is UG and PG degrees at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness on ICT devices among UG and PG qualified Student-Teachers were similar whereas the Utilization of ICT facilities by the UG qualified is more than the PG qualified Student-Teachers.
Table 4.26

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Major Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65.55</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65.55</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

The Table 4.26 reveals that the ‘t’ values 1.58, 0.77, 1.00 and 0.19 of the Awareness and Utilization category are Not Significant whereas 2.36 and 2.45 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that the Awareness of the Arts, Mathematics and Science major Student-Teachers are similar. It is to be noted that the Utilization of ICT facilities among Mathematics and Science major Student-Teachers is high while comparing Arts major Student-Teachers.
Table 4.27

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers of School Education-Graduate Parents on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.05</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>60.43</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the Table 4.27 that the ‘t’ values 0.80 and 0.49 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices between the Student-Teachers with regard to Parent’s Education are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the Mean scores that, the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT facilities among the Student-Teachers with regard to their Parents Education were similar.
### Table 4.28

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>3.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>4.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.68</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is seen from the Table 4.28 that the ‘t’ values 1.74, 1.39 and 1.56 of the average Mean scores of Awareness category are Not Significant whereas 2.36, 3.87 and 4.22 of Utilization category are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness of the Student-Teachers with respect to Parents Occupation were similar whereas the Student-Teachers of Agriculture parents are utilizing more ICT facilities than the others.
Table 4.29
‘t’ Values Between the Mean Scores of Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.68</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.88</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level
** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the Table 4.29 that the ‘t’ values 0.52, 0.70, 1.45 and 0.98 are Not Significant and the values 2.67 and 2.47 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the average Mean scores that the Awareness among the Student-Teachers of Business and Government Employed parents are more than that of the Private/Other Employed parents, whereas the Utilization of the ICT facilities among the Student-Teachers of Business, Government and Private/Other Employed parents were similar.
4.3.4 Relationship of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Colleges with Low Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the Correlation analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Colleges of Education with Low Availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the Table 4.30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>‘r’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25 Years</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 30 Years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Major Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Parent’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Educated</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level
The Table 4.30 reveals that the ‘r’ values between the average Mean scores of Student-Teachers’ Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities pertaining to the variables such as Student-Teachers in Total, Sex, Locality, Age, Marital Status, Community, Qualification, Major Subject, Parent’s Education and Parent’s Occupation are Not Significant whereas among the student teachers of Private/Other Employed parents it is Significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Student-Teachers with regard to the Student-Teachers in Total, Sex, Locality, Age, Marital Status, Community, Qualification, Major Subject, Parent’s Education and Parent’s Occupation were similar whereas among the Student-Teachers of Private/Others Employed parents the Awareness on ICT devices is more and the Utilization of the ICT facilities is lesser.

4.3.5 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT Devices between the Colleges with Low and High Availability of ICT devices

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices between the Student-Teachers of the Colleges with Low and High availability of ICT devices. The results are presented in the Tables 4.31 to 4.39.
Table 4.31
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Male-Female Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t ’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65.06</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>67.08</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61.24</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.31 it is revealed that the ‘t’ value 1.71 of the Awareness category is Not Significant whereas 3.61, 2.30 and 6.61 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness of the Male Student-Teachers were similar. Regarding the Utilization of ICT facilities, Male Student-Teachers of Low Availability Colleges are utilizing more ICT facilities. Among the Female Student-Teachers both the Awareness and Utilization were more among the High Availability Colleges.
Table 4.32

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Rural-Urban Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>65.51</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>67.56</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>61.04</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59.72</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>61.15</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is understood from the Table 4.32 that the ‘t’ values 2.00, 3.51 of Awareness and 2.88, 6.27 of the Utilization category are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities among the Rural and Urban Student-Teachers are significantly more in the High Availability Colleges than the Low Availability Colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65.17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>60.54</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>8.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>61.64</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.18</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the Table 4.33 it is found that the ‘t’ values 5.15 and 8.14 are Significant and 0.34, 0.08, 0.54 and 0.12 are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that the Awareness and the Utilization among the High Availability Colleges is significantly more than the Low Availability Colleges among the 20-25 years Age group whereas the Awareness is similar among all the other Age group Student-Teachers.
Table 4.34
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Married-Unmarried Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t ’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66.29</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>58.01</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>62.03</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the Table 4.34 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 0.81 of Awareness and 1.28 of the Utilization are Not Significant and 4.67 and 7.46 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that among the Married Student-Teachers the Awareness and Utilization were similar. In the case of the Unmarried Student-Teachers, both the Awareness and the Utilization are significantly more among the High Availability Colleges than the Low Availability Colleges.
Table 4.35

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64.35</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>68.04</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63.30</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58.73</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the Table 4.35 it is seen that the ‘t’ values 0.85, 1.35 of Awareness, 1.21 and 1.89 of the Utilization category are Not Significant and 3.18 and 5.55 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that among SC and MBC Student-Teachers the Awareness and Utilization are similar whereas regarding the BC both the Awareness and Utilization are significantly more among the High Availability Colleges than the Low Availability Colleges.
TABLE 4.36
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College UG-PG qualified Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t ’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>65.46</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>67.66</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>67.54</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>5.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58.48</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>3.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is understood from the Table 4.36 that the ‘t’ values 3.09, 2.33, 5.02 and 3.66 of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities among the UG and PG qualified Student-Teachers are more in the High Availability Colleges than the Low Availability Colleges.
Table 4.37
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Major Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65.55</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the Table 4.37 that the ‘t’ values 2.05 of Awareness and 2.66, 2.15 and 3.65 of the Utilization category are Significant and the values 1.74 and 1.59 are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that the Awareness among the Arts and Mathematics major Student-Teachers were similar whereas it is more among the High Availability Colleges in the Science major Student-Teachers. Also it is inferred that the Arts and Science major Student-Teachers are utilizing more ICT facilities in the High Availability Colleges and is different among the Mathematics major Student-Teachers.
Table 4.38
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Student-Teachers of School Education-Graduate Parents on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness SE</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.05</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization SE</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>60.43</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>5.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>61.39</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>L A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H A</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60.90</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

On observing the above Table 4.38 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 3.68 of Awareness and 5.78 of Utilization category are Significant and the values 1.27 and 1.88 are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the above results that the Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of School Educated parents is more among the High Availability Colleges. Among the Student-Teachers of Graduate Parents, the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT facilities were similar.
Table 4.39
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Low and High Availability College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/ Others</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>61.08</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/ Others</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.68</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level   ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is seen from the Table 4.39 that the ‘t’ values 1.65, 0.50, 1.61, 1.54 and 0.79 are Not Significant and the values 2.17, 2.64 and 3.01 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness on ICT devices among the Student-Teachers with regard to Parent’s Occupation are similar. The Utilization of the ICT facilities it is more among
the Low Availability College Student-Teachers of Agriculture parents and is opposite among the Government and Private/Other employed parents. But among the Student-Teachers of Business parents the Utilization were similar in both the Low and High Availability Colleges.

4.3.6 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of Government Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Government Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the Tables 4.40 to 4.46.

Table 4.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69.26</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>68.81</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61.86</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>60.14</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.40 it is understood that the ‘t’ values 0.83 and 1.61 of Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities between the Male and Female Student-Teachers of Government Colleges of Education are Not
Significant at 0.05 level. It is revealed from the results that the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities were similar among the Male and Female Student-Teachers.

**Table 4.41**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>61.65</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60.13</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level   ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the above Table 4.41 that the ‘t’ values 1.79 and 1.39 of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the above results that there is no difference in the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities among the Student-Teachers of Government College of Education of Rural and Urban localities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69.52</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69.52</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69.15</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69.15</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.69</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.44</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.44</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60.65</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.69</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60.65</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

On observing the Table 4.42 it is seen that the ‘t’ values 1.26, 0.59 and 1.26 on Awareness and 0.15, 0.60 and 0.75 of Utilization of ICT facilities are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is inferred from the results that the Awareness and the Utilization of ICT facilities among the Student-Teachers with regard to the Community were similar.
Table 4.43

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Government College UG-PG qualified Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69.08</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61.75</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

On observing the above Table 4.43 it revealed that the ‘t’ values 0.11 and 1.31 of the average Mean scores of Awareness and Utilization Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities among the UG and PG qualified Student-Teachers of Government Colleges of Education were similar.
Table 4.44
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Government College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Major Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61.20</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61.20</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the above Table 4.44 that the ‘t’ value 2.56 of the Awareness category is Significantly Different and 1.89, 0.99, 0.08, 0.39 and 0.26 are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that Arts major Student-Teachers are well aware of ICT facilities than the Mathematics major Student-Teachers. But the Awareness on ICT facilities was similar among the other major Student-Teachers. Also it is revealed that the Utilization of ICT facilities among all major Student-Teachers were similar.
Table 4.45
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Government College Student-Teachers of School Education-Graduate Parents on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the Table 4.45 it is clear that the ‘t’ values 0.37 of Awareness and 1.53 of the Utilization of ICT devices are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is inferred from the results that the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT facilities among the Government College Student-Teachers with regard to Parents Education were similar.
Table 4.46
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Government College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parents Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.72</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.72</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>3.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the above Table 4.46 that the ‘t’ values 1.42, 0.06 and 1.34 of Awareness and 1.93 and 0.84 of the Utilization category are Not Significant and 3.20 is Significant at 0.05 level. It is observed from the results that among the Government College of Education all the Student-Teachers are equally aware of the ICT devices. Regarding Utilization the Student-Teachers of Agriculture Parents more significantly utilize ICT facilities than the others.
4.3.7 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among Aided Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of the Aided Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.47 to 4.53.

Table 4.47

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Aided College Male-Female Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>2.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.47 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 1.27 of the Awareness is Not Significant and 2.97 for the Utilization is Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that the Awareness among the Male and Female Student-Teachers were similar whereas the Utilization of ICT facilities by the Male Student-Teachers were more than the Female Student-Teachers.
Table 4.48

‘t’ Values  between the Mean Scores of Aided College Rural-Urban Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68.62</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65.12</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.40</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is obvious from the above Table 4.48 that the ‘t’ value 1.08 of Awareness is Not Significant and the 4.88 Utilization of ICT facilities are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness on ICT devices were similar among the Rural and Urban locality whereas Student-Teachers of the Rural locality are utilizing more ICT facilities than the Urban locality Student-Teachers.
### Table 4.49

‘t’ Values Between the Mean Scores of Aided College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.49</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.68</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.68</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.49</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  
** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

On observing the Table 4.49 it is revealed that the ‘t’ values 1.38, 1.02 and 1.20 are Not Significant and the values 3.12, 2.22 and 4.04 are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness is more among the BC Student-Teachers whereas the SC Student-Teachers are utilizing more ICT facilities.
Table 4.50

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Aided College UG-PG qualified Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.50 that the ‘t’ values 0.02 of Awareness and 0.82 of the Utilization category are Not Significant at 0.05 level. Hence it is understood that the Awareness and Utilization of the UG and PG qualified Student-Teachers of Aided Colleges were similar.
### Table 4.51

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Aided College Mathematics-Science Major Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.87</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63.22</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level
** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.51 that the ‘t’ values 2.03 of Awareness and 2.11 of the Utilization Category are Significant at 0.05 level. On observing the average Mean scores it is understood that the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT facilities are more among the Science major than the Mathematics major Student-Teachers.
Table 4.52

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Aided College Student-Teachers of College Education-Professional Parents on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.77</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.52 that the ‘t’ values 0.02 of Awareness and 1.95 of the Utilization of ICT devices are Not Significant at 0.05 level. The results reveal that both the Awareness and Utilization of ICT facilities among the Aided College Student-Teacher’s with regard to their Parent’s Education were similar.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67.49</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67.49</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.83</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63.83</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from the above Table 4.53 that the ‘t’ values 0.44, 0.37 and 1.64 were Not Significant and 2.40, 2.02 and 2.28 were Significant at 0.05 level. From the results it is understood that the Student-Teachers of Agriculture and Private/Other employed parents have similar Awareness and is lesser than the Government Employed. Regarding the Utilization of ICT facilities, the Student-Teachers of Agriculture Parents were utilizing more ICT facilities than the Government and Private/Other Employed Parents.
4.3.8 Level of Awareness and Utilization of ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of Self-Financing Colleges of Education

This section deals with the analysis of the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT devices among the Student-Teachers of Self-Financing Colleges of Education. The results are presented in the following Tables 4.54 to 4.60.

Table 4.54
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College Male-Female Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>69.12</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>58.81</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>56.98</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.54 it is understood that the ‘t’ values 3.95 of Awareness and 2.88 of the Utilization of ICT facilities are Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness among the Female Student-Teachers is more whereas the Male Student-Teachers were utilizing more ICT facilities than the Female Student-Teachers.
Table 4.55
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College Rural-Urban Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is found from the above Table 4.55 that the ‘t’ values 1.71 of Awareness and the value 0.89 of the Utilization of ICT facilities are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that both the Awareness and Utilization of the ICT facilities between the Rural and Urban Student-Teachers of Self-Financing Colleges of Education were similar.
Table 4.56

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>69.22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>69.22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the Table 4.56 that the ‘t’ values 1.91, 1.90 and 0.59 were Not Significant and 3.97, 3.37 and 4.45 were Significant at 0.05 level. From the results it is revealed that the Awareness among SC and MBC Student-Teachers were similar and is lesser than the BC Student-Teachers. Regarding the Utilization the SC Student-Teachers utilize more ICT devices than the MBC and BC Student-Teachers.
Table 4.57
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College UG-PG qualified Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>58.09</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>56.48</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.57 that the ‘t’ value 1.32 of the average Mean scores of Awareness are Not Significant and 2.45 of Utilization of ICT devices are Significant at 0.05 level. It is inferred from the results that both UG and PG qualified Student-Teachers are equally aware of ICT devices whereas UG qualified are utilizing ICT devices to the fullest extent than the PG qualified Student-Teachers.
**Table 4.58**

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Major Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Utilization| Arts    | 173   | 56.94   | 6.27 | 0.24** |
|            | Mathematics | 122   | 57.13   | 7.14 |       |
|            | Mathematics | 122   | 57.13   | 7.14 | 1.46** |
|            | Science    | 247   | 58.30   | 7.49 |       |
|            | Arts       | 173   | 56.94   | 6.27 | 2.02*  |
|            | Science    | 247   | 58.30   | 7.49 |       |

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.58 that the ‘t’ values 1.14, 0.31, 1.02, 0.24 and 1.46 were Not Significant and the value 2.02 is Significant at 0.05 level. It is revealed from the results that Student-Teachers of all major are having similar Awareness on ICT devices whereas regarding Utilization, Arts and Mathematics major Student-Teachers were utilizing similarly but were lesser than the Science major Student-Teachers.
Table 4.59

‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College Student-Teachers of School Education-Graduate Parents on Awareness and Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57.68</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level    ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

From the above Table 4.59 the results reveal that the ‘t’ values 1.71 and 0.15 of Awareness and Utilization are Not Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood that the Student-Teachers of School Educated and Graduate parents have similar Awareness and are utilizing the ICT facilities equally.
Table 4.60
‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Self-Financing College Student-Teachers on Awareness and Utilization with regard to Parent’s Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>68.99</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>68.99</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>56.31</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>56.31</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level ** Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is clearly seen from the above Table 4.60 that the ‘t’ values 1.39, 0.02, 1.07, 1.78 and 0.77 were Not Significant and 3.05 is Significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Awareness among the Student-Teachers of Parents with all the Occupations were similar. Regarding the Utilization of ICT facilities the Student-Teachers of Government and Private/Other employed parents were similar and were significantly lesser than the Agriculture parents.

The ensuring Chapter deals with the Summary and Conclusion.