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The Job Satisfaction Inventory was used to find the correlation between the Job Satisfaction, and variables such as locality, sex, faculty, management, marital status, qualification, designation, age, experience and the size of the family. It was also used to correlate job satisfaction with 16 personality factors and neuroticism.

The attitude scale Questionnaire was used to correlate the attitude of teachers towards teaching with variables such as locality, sex, faculty, management, marital status, qualification, designation, age, experience, the size of the family and neuroticism. It was also used to find the correlation between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and 16 Personality factors.

Finally the job satisfaction of teachers and attitude of teachers towards teaching were correlated.

Results were tabulated and interpretation of data were explained in the succeeding paragraphs.
5.1 LOCALITY Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 01

There is no difference between the level of job satisfaction of urban and rural higher secondary school teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Locality (Rural/Urban)</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>42,138.8</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,133.8</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The results of analysis of job satisfaction by ANOVA are presented in the above table. It may be seen that the obtained 'F' ratio of 0.67 was not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

So, it could be concluded that the locality of the Higher Secondary School teachers do not have any effect on their job satisfaction. Therefore, the urban and rural teachers do not have difference in their job satisfaction.
5.2 SEX Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 02

There is no difference between the level of job satisfaction of male and female Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table : 02

Results Of Anova Of The Job Satisfaction Scores Of Teachers Classified According To The Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Sex (Male/Female)</td>
<td>208.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208.2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>42,019.9</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42228.1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The insignificant 'F' ratio for sex shows that men and women teachers do not differ in the level of their job satisfaction.

Hence the hypothesis given above was accepted.
Englehardt (1973), Atteberry (1977), Cohen (1977), Weaver (1977) and Padmanabhaiah (1984) also reported that there is no significant difference between men and women with regard to their job satisfaction. The result of the present study are in line with the results of these studies.

However, women teachers were found to be more satisfied than men teachers in the studies of Chase (1951), Belasco and Alutto (1972), Bernard and Kulandivel (1976), Anand (1977), Venkatarami Reddy and Krishna Reddy (1978), Venkatarami Reddy and Babjan (1980) and Venkatarami Reddy and Ramakrishnaiah (1981).

Contradicting the above results, Hollen and Gemmil (1976), Chen (1977) and Gobel (1977) observed that women teachers exhibited less job satisfaction than their men counterparts.

In conclusion, it could be seen that the difference in sex does not interfere in job satisfaction.
5.3 FACULTY Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 03

There is no difference between the job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers in Humanities and Science.

Table: 03

*Results Of Anova Of The Job Satisfaction Scores Of Teachers Classified According To The Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Faculty (Humanity/Science)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>42,217.6</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,228.1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87

- 0.01 level is 6.72

The obtained F value is not significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the above hypothesis was accepted. This shows teachers of Humanities and Science do not differ in their job satisfaction.

Hence it is concluded that the faculty does not affect the job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers.
5.4 MANAGEMENT VS JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO: 04

There is no difference between the job satisfaction among Government aided and Non-aided Higher Secondary teachers.

Table: 04

Results Of Anova Of The Job Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Management Aided/Non-Aided</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>42,084.5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,228.1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The results of ANOVA of the scores presented in the table 4 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted. This shows that there is no difference between the level of job satisfaction of Government and Private School teachers.

Hence it is concluded that the type of management of the school does not have influence on the job satisfaction.
5.5 MARITAL STATUS Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 05

There is no difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table 05
Results Of Anova Of The Job Satisfaction Scores Of Teachers Classified According To The Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Marital Status (Married/Unmarried)</td>
<td>0.260394909</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.260394909</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>42,227.6</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,228.1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72
The results of further analysis of job satisfaction scores by ANOVA are presented in the above table. It may be seen that the obtained F ratio of 0.01 was not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted. This shows that there is no difference in the level of job satisfaction between married and unmarried teachers.

The few studies that have been carried out to investigate into this aspect reported contradictory results. For example Inflow (1951), NEA (1957) and Venkatarami Reddy and Babjan (1980) found that married teachers were more satisfied than unmarried teachers. Sinha and Nair (1965), Neerja Dwivedi and Pestonjee (1975) and Chen (1977) also obtained similar results on factory workers, while Butler (1961) found that unmarried beginning teachers were more satisfied than their married counterparts. However AVA (1948), Redfer (1964), Venkatarami Reddy and Krishna Reddy (1978) and Ramakrishnaiah (1980) reported that there was no relationship between the two variables.

This result in line with the results of AVA (1994), Redfer (1964), Venkatarami Reddy and Krishna Reddy (1978) and Ramakrishnaiah (1980).

Hence it is concluded that job satisfaction is not affected by marital status.
5.6 QUALIFICATION Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

To probe into level of job satisfaction of teachers who have the minimum qualification and those who have higher than minimum qualification, the study is carried out with the teachers of different qualifications.

HYPOTHESIS NO. 06

There is no difference between the job satisfaction of higher Secondary School teachers with different qualifications such as graduate, double post graduate and Ph.D's.

Table: 06

Results Of Anova Of The Job Satisfaction Scores Of Teachers Classified According To The Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Qualification (Graduate /Post Graduate /Double Post Graduate / Ph.D)</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>42,155.7</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>141.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,228.1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87

0.01 level is 6.72

It could be seen from the table that the F-value is not significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the hypothesis No: 06 was accepted. This shows that the qualifications of the teachers were not effected the level of job satisfaction. Hence it is concluded that the qualification does not influence the job satisfaction.
5.7 DESIGNATION Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

Higher Secondary classes are handled by two types of teachers. They are

i. Post Graduate teachers and

ii. Trained graduate teachers (or) Inducted teachers

An analysis was carried out with the two types of teachers and the results are presented in the Table: 07.

HYPOTHESIS NO. 07

There is no difference between the job satisfaction of higher Secondary Post graduate and Inducted Trained graduate teachers.

Table: 07

Results Of Anova Of The Job Satisfaction Scores Of Teachers Classified According To Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Designation (PGT/TGT)</td>
<td>213.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>42,014.6</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>141.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,228.1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

It could be seen from the table that the obtained F ratio for designation was 0.75, i.e., not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis given above was accepted.

So, it could be concluded that the designation of teachers does not play a role in job satisfaction.
5.8 AGE Vs JOB SATISFACTION

HYPOTHESIS NO. 8

There is no relationship in the job satisfaction of young teachers and old teachers in higher secondary schools. The analysis carried out with the teachers of different ages are presented in the table 08.

Table No. 08

Results Of Correlation Between Job Satisfaction Of Teachers Vs Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0665</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table Value at 0.05 level is 0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01 level is 0.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculated co-efficient value was not significant at 0.05 level. Hence it could be concluded that there is no relationship between the job satisfaction and age.

This result is supported by other studies conducted by Rao (1970) Pestonjee and Singh (1973) and Anand (1977). They reported that there was no significant relationship between the age and the job satisfaction of workers.
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5.9 EXPERIENCE Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

Length of experience may be one of the significant variables which can influence the level of job satisfaction of the employees.

HYPOTHESIS NO. 09

There is no relationship in the job satisfaction of higher secondary school teachers with less experience and of those with more experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

It is not significant 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No:09 was accepted.

This shows that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and experience.

Rao (1970), Anand (1977) and Ramakrishnaiah (1980) in their studies also pointed out that the years of experience possessed by teachers had no role in the determination of job satisfaction. The results of the present study falls in line with those of the above studies.

Therefore it is concluded that the job satisfaction is not affected, by the experience of the teachers of higher secondary schools.
5.10 SIZE OF THE FAMILY Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

There is no relationship between the job satisfaction of higher secondary teachers with size of the family.

Table No.10

Results Of Relation Between Job Satisfaction Of Teachers Vs Size Of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.0302</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The value 0.0302 was not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted. So the size of the family would not have a significant bearing on their job satisfaction.

The co-efficient value is negative. This shows that if the size of the family increases, the level of job satisfaction decreases vice versa.

This result was supported by Ramakrishnaiah (1980) who also found that the size of the family did not have any bearing on the job satisfaction of teachers.

Therefore it could be concluded that there is no relationship between the Job satisfaction of higher secondary school teachers with size of the family.
5.11 PERSONALITY FACTOR A (SIZIA / AFFECTIA) Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 11

There is no relationship between the personality factor A (Sizia/Affectia) and Job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers

Table 11

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor A (Sizia/Affectia) Vs Job Satisfaction Of Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizia /Affectia (FA)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148
The results presented in Table: 11 is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected and an alternate hypothesis was accepted. The existence of relationship between the personality factor A (Sizia/Affectia) and job satisfaction of higher Secondary School teachers was accepted.

Further, it is seen from the above results that there is absolute positive relationship between the factor A and the job satisfaction of teachers.

The teachers with high job satisfaction will have pleasing manners.

The present study shows that the Higher Secondary Teachers of Coimbatore Distinct are soft-hearted, kind, generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism and better able to remember the names of the pupil. They will have characteristics of easy-goingness and interest in pupils, attentive to pupils etc.,

Hence, it could be concluded that the Higher Secondary teachers of Coimbatore District with high job satisfaction are soft hearted, kind and generous in personal relations, whereas the teachers with unpleasant manners have less job satisfaction.
5.12 PERSONALITY FACTOR B (LOW INTELLIGENCE / HIGH INTELLIGENCE) Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 12

There is no relationship between personality factor B (Low intelligence/High intelligence) and job satisfaction.

Table: 12

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor B (Low Intelligence / High Intelligence) Vs Job Satisfaction Of Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low intelligence / High intelligence (FB)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.05 level is 0.148
The above table shows the relationship between personality factor B and job satisfaction which is significant. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected and an alternate hypothesis was accepted "There is a relationship between the personality factor B and job satisfaction" and this was accepted.

The calculated co-efficient value is negative. Therefore, there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction of teachers and intelligence. If the intelligence of the teachers increases the job satisfaction of the teachers decreases.

The low score for the factor (B) shows that the teacher with low intelligence has more job satisfaction.

- Hence it is concluded that the Higher Secondary School Teachers of Coimbatore District with high job satisfaction are of low intelligence and concrete thinkers whereas the teachers with high intelligence are not satisfied with their job.
5.13 PERSONALITY FACTOR C (LOWER EGO STRENGTH / HIGHER EGO STRENGTH) Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 13

There is no relationship between the personality factor C (Lower ego strength / higher ego strength) and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table 13

**Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor C**

*(Lower Ego Strength / Higher Ego Strength)*

**And Job Satisfaction of Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ego Strength / Higher Ego Strength (FC)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148
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The calculated value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No. 13 was rejected and the alternative hypothesis, "There is relationship between the personality factor (C) and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers" was accepted.

The table value mentioned above is significant at 0.05 level. The calculated value is positive which shows that there is a positive relationship between ego strength and job satisfaction of teachers towards teaching. If the ego strength of the teachers increases, the job satisfaction also increases.

The high score for factor (C) shows that the teachers with high job satisfaction are emotionally less stable, and they are changeable.

Therefore it is concluded that the teachers who are emotionally less stable are having high job satisfaction, whereas the teachers with low job satisfaction are emotionally stable.
5.14 PERSONALITY FACTOR E Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 14

There is no relationship between personality factor E and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

Table 14

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor E (Submissiveness / Dominance) Vs Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.437</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissiveness / Dominance (FE)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the hypothesis was rejected. An alternative hypothesis, "There is a relationship between Personality factor E and Job satisfaction" was accepted.

The calculated co-efficient value is negative. This shows that if the Submissiveness, Dominance increases, the Job satisfaction decreases. The table value is less than the mid point (6). This low value of factor E shows that the teachers with high Job satisfaction are submissive, dependent, considerable, diplomatic, expressive, conventional and humble.

Hence it is clear that the teachers of submissive nature are more highly satisfied in their job than those who possess dominance in their nature.
5.15 PERSONALITY FACTOR F Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 15

There is no relationship between the personality factor F and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary Teachers.

Table 15

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor F
(Desurgency / Surgency) And Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desurgency / Surgency (FF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

It may be seen from the above table, that the value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence this hypothesis was rejected. An alternate hypothesis, "There is a relationship between personality factor F and job satisfaction" was accepted.

The negative value of the co-efficient shows that if the value of factor F increases, the job satisfaction decreases. They are negatively related to each other.

Therefore, it could be concluded that the teachers with more job satisfaction are slow and cautious whereas quick and alert teachers are having less job satisfaction.
5.16 PERSONALITY FACTOR G Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 16

There is no relationship between the Personality factor G and the job satisfaction.

Table 16

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor G
(Weaker Super Ego / Stronger Super Ego) Vs Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker Super Ego / Stronger Super Ego (FG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore the above hypothesis was rejected and an alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between the Personality factor G and job satisfaction" was accepted.
There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and the Personality factor G, which shows that if the value of the factor G increases, the Job satisfaction also increases.

The value of mean scores are higher then the midpoint (6), it shows that the responsible teachers are having more job satisfaction. The teachers with high job satisfaction are dominated by sense of duty and they are concerned about moral standards and rules.

Therefore it could be concluded that the responsible teachers have more job satisfaction than self-indulgent teachers.
5.17 PERSONALITY FACTOR H Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 17

There is no relationship between the Personality factor H and job satisfaction.

Table: 17

Results Of Relation Between The Personality Factor H
(Threctia/Parmia) Vs Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threctia / Parmia (FH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The obtained value is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

The positive co-efficient value shows that the value of factor H increases the job satisfaction also increases.

The mean score value is higher than the midpoint (6). This shows that the teachers with high job satisfaction are very bold and they move friendly with others. They are adventurous and impulsive.

To conclude, the bold teachers are more satisfied than the shy and timid teachers.
5.18 PERSONALITY FACTOR I Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 18.

There is no relationship between personality factor I and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary school teachers.

Table 18

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor I (Harria/Premsia) And Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harria / Premsia (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained above show that the hypothesis mentioned above was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between Personality factor I and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers was accepted.

The table value is positive which shows that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and factor I.

The higher score for the factor I shows that the teachers with more job satisfaction are tender minded, sensitive and clinging.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with more satisfaction are kind and gentle whereas unsentimental, self-reliant and hard natured teachers are less satisfied.
5.19 PERSONALITY FACTOR L VS JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 19

There is no relationship between the Personality factor L and the job satisfaction of Higher Secondary school teachers.

Table: 19

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor L

(Alaxia/Protension)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaxia / Protension (FL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The value obtained in the above table is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis mentioned above was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between the personality factor L and job satisfaction" was accepted. The calculated co-efficient value shows that there is negative relation between job satisfaction and the factor L. The mean scores are less than the midpoint (6) which shows that the teacher with more job satisfaction is easy going. He lacks ambition and striving, readily forgets difficulties and accepts personal unimportance. Hence it could be concluded that the job satisfaction is found to be high with the teacher who is a good team worker and one with jealous and dogmatic natures are less satisfied.
5.20 PERSONALITY FACTOR M Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 20

There is no relationship between the Personality factor M and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

Table 20

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor M 
(Praxernia/Autia) Vs Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxernia/Autia (FM)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No. 20 was rejected. An alternate hypothesis, "There is a relationship between the Personality factor M and Job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers" was accepted.

It is seen from the negative co-efficient value, the teacher is very much practical and imaginative. Hence the job satisfaction decreases.

The value of the mean scores are less than the midpoint (6), which shows the teachers with more job satisfaction are concerned with immediate interests and issues. Hence it could be concluded that the teachers who have alert to practical needs and conventional, are more satisfied in their job than the teachers with higher internal spasmodic nature, anxious and conflicting tensions.
5.21 PERSONALITY FACTOR N (ARTLESSNESS/SHREWWDNESS) Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 21

There is no relationship between the personality factor N and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table: 21

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor N (Artlessness/Shrewdness) Vs Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artlessness / Shrewdness (FN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained in the above table is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis was accepted.

The calculated value shows that there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and the factor N. That is, if the artlessness or shrewdness of teacher increases, the job satisfaction will get decreased. The values of the mean scores are less than the midpoint (6), which shows that the teachers with high job satisfaction are unsophisticated, sentimental and simple. He lacks self insight. He is content with what comes. He has blind trust in human nature and has simple tastes. Hence it could be concluded that a teacher with artlessness is more satisfied in his job then the one with shrewdness.
5.22 PERSONALITY FACTOR O Vs JOB SATISFACTION.

HYPOTHESIS NO. 22

There is no relationship between Personality factor O and Job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table: 22

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor O (Untroubled Adequacy/Guilt Proneness) Vs Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.951</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untroubled Adequacy / Guilt Proneness (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The above table value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No: 22 was rejected. An alternative hypothesis "There is a relationship between personality factor O and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers" was accepted.

The negative co-efficient value shows that, if the value of factor O increases there is a decrease in job satisfaction, both are negatively related. The mean scores of the factor O is 6.00 which is the exact midpoint value. This shows that the teachers with high job satisfaction are either self confident or depressed. The teacher will be neither sensitive nor insensitive to people's approval or disapproval. Hence it could be concluded that the job satisfaction of both the type of teachers (self-confident or depressed) remains the same.
There is no relationship between the Personality factor Q₁ and Job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

Table: 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism of temperament radicalism (FQ₁)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The value is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis mentioned above was accepted.

The positive value of the co-efficient shows that the personality factor Q₁ and job satisfaction are positively related that is, if one increases the other also increases.

High value of mean scores implies that the teachers with high job satisfaction are very liberal, well informed, much inclined to experiment with problem solutions, less inclined to moralize, less unquestioning about views, etc.

Hence it could be concluded that very liberal and well informed teachers are more satisfied then the conservative teachers who are less satisfied.
5.24 PERSONALITY FACTOR Q₂ Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 24

There is no relationship between the Personality factor Q₂ and Job satisfaction of the Higher Secondary School Teachers.

Table. 24

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor Q₂ (Group Adherence/ Self Sufficiency) And The Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group adherence / Self sufficiency (FQ₂)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results in the above table is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No.24 was accepted.

The co-efficient value shows that Personality factor Q₂ and Job satisfaction are negatively related.

The low value of the mean score for factor Q₂ shows that the teacher with more job satisfaction is a sound follower of the group. He depends definitely on social approval and is fashionable.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with more job satisfaction are sound followers of the group and the teachers who are more dissatisfied with the group integration are less satisfied in their job.
5.25 PERSONALITY FACTOR Q3 Vs JOB SATISFACTION

HYPOTHESIS NO. 25

There is no relationship between the Personality factor Q3 and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers.

**Table. 25**

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor Q3, (Low Self-Sentiment Integration / High Strength Of Self Sentiment) And The Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low self-sentiment / High Strength Self Sentiment</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The calculated value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the above hypothesis was rejected and an alternative hypothesis "There is a relationship between personality factor Q3 and job satisfaction of higher secondary teachers" was accepted. The calculated co-efficient value shows that there is a positive relationship between the Personality factor Q3 and Job satisfaction.

The high score for the factor Q3 shows that the teachers with more job satisfaction have socially approved character and responsive. They have self-control, are persistent, are forthright, considerate to others and conscientious.

Hence it could be concluded the teacher with more job satisfaction is the one who responds to social rules and the teacher who does not bother about social rules are less satisfied in their job.
5.26 PERSONALITY FACTOR Q₄ Vs JOB SATISFACTION:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 26

There is no relationship between the Personality factor Q₄ and the job satisfaction of the Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table: 26

Results Of Relation Between Personality Factor Q₄, (Low Ergic Tension / High Ergic Tension) And Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALculated Co-Efficient</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.977</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ergic tension / High ergic tension (FQ₄)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.977</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained is significant at 0.05 level. This shows that the above hypothesis was rejected. An alternate hypothesis: "There is a relationship between the Personality factor Q₄ and job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers" was accepted.

From the table value it may be seen that there is a negative relationship between Job satisfaction and the factor Q₄.

The mean score value is less than the midpoint. This shows that the teachers with high job satisfaction are relaxed, calm and satisfied. Hence it could be concluded that the teacher with related and calm nature are more satisfied in their job then the teacher with high ergic tension.
HYPOTHESIS NO. 27

There is no relationship between the Personality factor NSQ and Job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.955</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (NSQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between Neuroticism and Job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School" was accepted.

There is a negative relation between the Job satisfaction and Neuroticism. This shows that if job satisfaction increases, the level of neuroticism decreases and vice versa.

Fisher and Hanna (1931), Mehdi and sinha (1971) and Anand, (1977) found that the job satisfaction and neuroticism were negatively correlated. The results of the study falls in line with those of the above studies.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with high level of neuroticism are less satisfied.
5.28 LOCALITY Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING.

HYPOTHESIS NO. 28

There is no difference between the attitudes of Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers and Rural Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching.

Table : 28

Results Of Anova Of The Attitude Scores
Of The Teachers Classified According To The Locality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Locality (Rural / Urban)</td>
<td>512.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>512.0</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>49,302.9</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>165.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The results obtained above are not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis 28 was accepted.

It may be seen from the result that the teachers who belong to urban and rural Higher Secondary Schools do not vary in their attitudes towards teaching.

Hence it could be concluded that there is no difference between the attitude of urban and rural Higher Secondary School teachers, towards teaching.
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5.29 SEX Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 29

There is no difference between the sex and attitude of teachers towards teaching.

Table 29

Results Of Anova Of The Attitude

Scores Of The Teachers Classified According To The Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Sex (Male/Female)</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>49,677.7</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The results of ANOVA of the attitude scores presented in Table 29 show that the F ratio of 0.82 was not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

Therefore it could be concluded that there is no significant difference between the level of attitude of the male and female teachers towards teaching.
5.30 FACULTY Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 30

There is no difference between the attitude of science teachers of Higher secondary Schools and the teachers of Humanities of Higher Secondary Schools.

Table : 30

Results Of Anova Of The Attitude Scores

Of The Teachers Classified According To Their Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups faculty Science/</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of</td>
<td>49,812.2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers towards teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The table : 30 provides the F ratio of 0.02 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

It may be seen from the table value that there is no significant difference between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and teachers in various disciplines.

Hence it could be concluded that faculty to which the teachers belong does not influence their attitude towards teaching.
5.31 MANAGEMENT Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 31

There is no difference between the attitude of Government aided and non-aided higher Secondary School Teachers Towards teaching.

Table. 31

Results Of Anova Of The Attitude Scores Of The Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Management of Schools (Govt Aided / Non aided)</td>
<td>533.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>266.9</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>49281.0</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The calculated value is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No. 31 was accepted.

This shows that there was no significant difference in the attitude of the three groups of teachers towards teaching.

Hence it could be concluded that the management of the school does not have influence on the attitude of teachers towards teaching.
5.32 MARITAL STATUS Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

**HYPOTHESIS NO 32**

There is no difference between the attitude of married and unmarried Higher Secondary School Teachers Towards teaching.

Table. 32

*Results Of Anova Of The Attitude Scores Of The Teachers Classified According Qualification To The Marital Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups marital status (married / unmarried)</td>
<td>0.197688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.197688</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>49,814.7</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87

0.01 level is 6.72

The results obtained above are not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No.32 was accepted.

It can be seen from the results the married and unmarried Higher Secondary School Teachers would not differ significantly with regard to their attitude towards teaching.

Hence it could be concluded that there is no difference between the attitude of married and unmarried higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching.
5.33 QUALIFICATION Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 33

There is no difference in the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers with different qualifications such as graduate, post graduate, double post graduate and Ph.D towards teaching.

Table: 33

Results Of Anova Of The Attitude Scores Of The Teachers Classified According Eccovdnng To The Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Qualification (graduate / Post graduate / Double Post graduate / Ph.D)</td>
<td>415.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>49,399.1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

It could be seen from the table that the F value is not significant. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted. Further, seen from the above results, it is evident that there is no significant difference between the qualification and attitude of teachers towards teaching. Hence it could be concluded that the qualification does not influence the attitude of teachers towards teaching.
5.34 DESIGNATION Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 34

There is no difference between the attitudes of post graduate teachers and inducted trained graduate teachers of the Higher Secondary School towards teaching.

Table 34

Results Of Anova Of The Attitude Scores Of The Teachers

Classified According To The Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>OBTAINED F-VALUE</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Designation (PGT/TGT)</td>
<td>1231.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>615.8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences in Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>48,583.2</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,814.9</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 3.87
0.01 level is 6.72

The results of the above table are not significant at 0.05 level.

Hence the hypothesis No.34 was accepted.

This shows that attitude of post graduate teachers and inducted trained graduate teachers of Higher Secondary Schools does not differ significantly.

Hence it could be concluded that the designation does not affect the attitude of teachers towards teaching.
5.35 AGE Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO.35

There is no relationship between the attitudes of young teachers and old teachers of Higher Secondary Schools towards teaching.

Table No.35

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0441</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

It is seen from the table, that the obtained value is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

From the above results it can be seen that there is no relationship between the attitudes of young teachers and old teachers of higher secondary schools towards teaching.

Therefore, it could be concluded that age does not have any influence on the attitude of teachers towards teaching.
5.36 EXPERIENCE Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 36

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers with less experience and more experience towards teaching.

Table No.36

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained from the above table shows that the value is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis mentioned above was accepted.

Further, the teachers with less experience and those with more experience do not differ in their attitude towards teaching.

Hence it could be concluded that there is no relationship between the attitudes of higher secondary teachers with less experience and more experience towards teaching.
5.37 SIZE OF THE FAMILY Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 37

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers belonging to small family and big family towards teaching.

Table No.37

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And Size Of The Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Family</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The calculated value is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No. 37 was accepted.

It is seen from the results that the teachers belonging to small and big family do not differ in their attitude towards teaching.

Hence it could be concluded that there is no relationship between the attitudes of higher secondary school teachers belong to small family and big family towards teaching.
5.38 PERSONALITY FACTOR A Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 38

There is no relationship between the attitudes of Higher secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the Personality factor A.

Table No.38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sizia / Affectia) (FA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148.

The results obtained above is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No.38 was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between the attitudes of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and personality factor A was accepted. The calculated value shows that a positive relationship exists between factor A and the attitude of teachers towards teaching. The high value of the mean scores for the factor A shows that the teachers with high attitude towards teaching will have characters of easy goingness, accessibility, emotion, interest in pupils, attentiveness to pupils, soft-heartedness, kindliness and adaptability. Hence it could be concluded that the teacher who is generous in personal relations has more attitude towards teaching then the teacher with unpleasant manners.
5.39 PERSONALITY FACTOR B VS ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 39

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the Personality factor B.

Table No.39

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs The Personality Factor B (Low Intelligence / High Intelligence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low intelligence / High Intelligence (FB)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The obtained value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No. 39 was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the Personality factor B was accepted.

The calculated co-efficient value is negative. This shows that, if the value of factor (B) increases, the attitude of teachers towards teaching decreases. The mean score value is less than the mid point. This shows the teachers with high attitude towards teaching are of low intelligence. Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with low intelligence, have high attitude towards teaching than the highly intelligent teachers.
5.40 PERSONALITY FACTOR C Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 40

There is no relationship between attitudes of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and Personality factor C.

Table No.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ego Strength/Higher Ego Strength (FC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis 40 was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between the attitudes of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor" is accepted. It is seen from the table that there is a positive relationship between the Personality Factor C and the attitude of teachers towards teaching. The mean score value is above the midpoint. This shows that the teachers with high attitude towards teaching are emotionally mature, stable, calm, realistic about life, and better be able to maintain high group morale. Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with stable and calm nature will have higher attitude towards teaching than the teachers who are dissatisfied with the world situations and their families.
5.41 PERSONALITY FACTOR E Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 41

There is no relationship between the Personality factor E and the attitudes of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the Personality factor E.

Table No.41

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs The Personality Factor E (Submissiveness / Dominance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissiveness / Dominance (FE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained above is significant at 0.05 level. This shows that the hypothesis No. 41 was rejected.

It may be seen from the negative value of the calculated co-efficient that there is a negative relationship between Personality factor E and the attitude of teachers towards teaching.

The mean score value for the factor E is less than the midpoint. This shows that the teachers with high attitude towards teaching will have the following characteristics. They are submissive, dependent, considerate, diplomatic, expressive, conventional, conforming to rules and humble. To conclude teachers with humble manner have a better attitude towards teaching than the teachers who are tough.
5.42 PERSONALITY FACTOR F Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 42

There is no relationship between attitudes of teachers towards teaching and the Personality factor F.

Table No.42

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs The Personality Factor F (Desurgency / Surgency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desurgency/Surgency (FF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The obtained value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. The calculated co-efficient value reveals that there is a negative relationship between the attitudes of the Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor F. This shows, that if the value of factor F increases the attitude of teachers towards teaching, decreases.

The value of the mean score for factor F is less than the midpoint. This shows that the teachers with better attitude towards teaching will be silent, introspective, full of cares concerned, reflective, incommunicative, slow and cautious.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers who are slow and cautious are having more attitude towards teaching than the teachers who are quick and alert.
5.43 PERSONALITY FACTOR G Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 43

There is no relationship between the attitudes of teachers towards teaching and Personality factor G.

*Table No. 43*

*Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs The Personality Factor G (Weaker Super Ego / Stronger Super Ego)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker Super Ego / Stronger Super Ego (FG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148.

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. An alternative hypothesis "There is a relationship between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and the personality factor G" was accepted. The positive co-efficient value shows that the relation between the personality factor G and the attitude of teachers towards teaching are positive.

The mean score value is greater than the midpoint (6). This shows that the teachers with high attitude towards teaching are responsible, emotionally disciplined, consistently ordered, determined and concerned about moral standards and rules. Hence it could be concluded that the teacher who is concerned about the moral standards and the rules will have better attitude towards teaching than the teacher who lacks acceptance of the group moral standards.
5.44 PERSONALITY FACTOR II Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 44

There is no relationship between the attitude of higher secondary school and the personality factor H. (Threctia / Parmia).

Table No.44

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And
The Personality Factor H (Threctia /Parmia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threctia / Parmia (FH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.05 level is 0.148

The results obtained in the above table are not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

The calculated co-efficient value is positive which shows that there is a positive relationship between the attitude towards teaching and the personality factor H.

The high score of factor H shows that the teachers with high attitude towards teaching tend to be friendly, adventurous and impulsive. They show little inhibition by environmental threat, feel free to participate and make more socio-emotional then task oriented ones.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with adventurous nature have more attitude towards teaching and those with any nature have less attitude towards teaching.
There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the Personality factor I (Harria/Premsia).

**Table No.45**

*Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And The Personality Factor I (Harria / Premsia)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harria / Premsia (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113  
0.01 level is 0.148

The calculated value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. An alternate hypothesis, "There is a relationship between the attitude of higher secondary school teachers towards teaching and the personality factor I" was accepted. The calculated co-efficient value is positive. This shows that there is a positive relationship between the attitude of teacher towards teaching and the personality factor I.

The high score value shows that the teachers with more attitude towards teaching are kind, gentle and imaginative in inner life and in conversation. They seek sympathy and help from others. They expect affection and attention from others.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers with kind and gentle nature have more attitude towards teaching than the teachers who are tough.
5.46 PERSONALITY FACTOR L Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 46

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers Towards teaching and the personality factor L. (Alaxia/Protension).

Table No.46

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And The Personality Factor L (Alaxia / Protension)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaxia / Protension (FL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained in the above table is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected.

An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between the attitude of higher secondary school teachers towards teaching and the personality factor L" was accepted.

The calculated co-efficient value is negative. This shows that if the value of the factor L increases, the attitude towards teaching decreases.

Therefore it could be concluded that the teacher who is adaptable, cheerful and has an uncompetitive built has more attitude towards teaching than the teacher who is jealous, dogmatic tyrannical and easily irritable.
5.47 PERSONALITY FACTOR M Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 47

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor M. (Praxernia/Autia).

Table No.47

Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And The Personality Factor M (Praxernia / Autia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxernia / Autia (FM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The table value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. An alternate hypothesis, "There is a relationship between the attitude of higher secondary school teachers towards teaching and the personality factor M" was accepted. The negative co-efficient value shows a negative relationship between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and the factor M.

The table value shows that the value of the mean score for the factor M is below the midpoint. This shows that the teacher with more attitude towards teaching tends to do the right things, and he is alert to practical needs and conventional. He is dependable in practical judgement, and earnest in thinking. Hence it could be concluded that the teachers who are more practical have more attitude towards teaching than those who are imaginative.
5.48 PERSONALITY FACTOR N Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 48

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and their Personality factor N. (Shrewdness / Artlessness).

Table No.48

| RESULTS OF RELATION BETWEEN THE ATTITUDE OF TEACHERS TOWARDS TEACHING VS THE PERSONALITY FACTOR N (ARTLESSNESS / SHREWDSNESS) |
|---|---|---|
| VARIABLES | N | CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT | LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE |
| Attitude of teachers towards teaching | 300 | -0.062 | Not Significant at 0.05 level |
| Artlessness / Shrewdness | | | |

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained above are not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

The mean score value for factor N is 5.3 which is less than the midpoint (6). This shows that the teacher with more attitude towards teaching tends to be unsophisticated, sentimental and simple. He lacks self insight. He contents with what comes. He has blind trust in human nature and has simple tastes. He acts warmly, and is emotionally involved. He has a vague and injudicious mind.

Hence it could be concluded that the unsophisticated teachers have more attitude towards teachers then the teachers who are polished, wordly and shrewed.
5.49 PERSONALITY FACTOR O Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 49

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor (O) (Untroubled Adequacy/Guilt Proneness).

Table No. 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.959</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untroubled adequacy/ Proneness (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained above are significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No.49 was rejected. An alternate hypothesis "There is a relationship between the attitude towards teaching and the personality factor (O)" was accepted.

The negative co-efficient value shows that if the factor (O) increases, the attitude of teacher towards teaching also increases. The mean score value exactly lies on the midpoint which shows both the groups of the factor (O) will have the same attitude towards teaching.

Hence it could be concluded that the teacher who is self assured and who is depressed has the same attitude towards teaching.
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5.50 PERSONALITY FACTOR $Q_1$ Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 50

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor $Q_1$, (Conservatism of temperament/Radicalism).

Table No.50

**Results Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching Vs The Personality Factor $Q_1$ (Conservatism / Radicalism)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism / radicalism ($FQ_1$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113

0.01 level is 0.148

The obtained table value is greater than the midpoint. This shows that the teacher with more attitude towards teaching is more well informed and more inclined to experiment with problem solutions, but less inclined to moralize and less unquestioning about views.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers who are Experimentors, liberal, analytical, free thinking have more attitude towards teaching than the teachers who are conservative, and respecting established ideas.
5.51 PERSONALITY FACTOR Q2 Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 51

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor Q2. (Group adherence/self-sufficiency).

Table: 51

Result Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And The Factor Q2 (Group Adherence / Self-Sufficiency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group adherence / Self-sufficiency (FQ2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The obtained table value is not significant. Hence the above hypothesis was accepted.

The calculated co-efficient value is negative. This shows that there is a negative relationship between attitude towards teaching and the personality factor Q2.

The mean score value is less than the midpoint. This shows that the teacher with more attitude towards teaching goes with the group. He definitely depends on social approval more, and is fashionable. He is a sound follower of the group.

Hence it could be concluded that the teacher who is socially group dependent has more attitude towards teaching than the teacher who prefers own decisions.
5.52 PERSONALITY FACTOR Q₃ Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 52

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor Q₃. (Low Self-Sentiment Integration/high strength/self-sentiment.)

Table: 52

Result Of Relation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And The Personality Factor Q₃

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Sentiment Integration / High Strength Self-Sentiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The obtained value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. The table shows that there is a positive relationship between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and the personality factor Q₃. The table value for factor Q₃ is a high value. This shows that the teachers with a better attitude towards teaching are self controlled, persistent, forthright, considerable and conscientious. They make more remarks in committee than others, especially problem-raising and solution offering comments, receive fewer votes as hindrances, and fewer rejections at the end of the sessions. Hence it can be concluded that the self controlled teachers are more satisfied than the teachers who are careless of social rules.
5.53 PERSONALITY FACTOR Q₄ Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 53

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards teaching and the personality factor Q₄. (Low ergic tension/High ergic tension).

Table: 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ergic tension/High Ergic tension (FQ₄)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained in the above table are significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No.53 was rejected.

The calculated co-efficient value is negative. Therefore there is a negative relationship between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and the personality factor Q₄.

The mean score value for factor Q₄ is less than the midpoint. This shows that the teachers with more attitude towards teaching are related, tranquil, torpid and unfrustrated.

Hence it could be concluded that the teachers who are frustrated have less attitude towards teaching than those who are relaxed.
5.54 NEUROTICISM Vs ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING:

HYPOTHESIS NO. 54

There is no relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School teachers towards teaching and Neuroticism.

Table 54

Correlation Between The Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching And Neuroticism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers towards teaching</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.946</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NSQ)/Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The calculated value is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the above hypothesis was rejected. An alternative hypothesis "There is a relationship between the attitude of Higher Secondary School teachers towards teaching and Neuroticism" was accepted.

The calculated coefficient value is negative. Therefore there is a negative relationship between the attitude of teachers towards teaching and Neuroticism.

Hence it may be concluded that differences in the level of neuroticism of the teachers affect the attitude of teachers towards teaching.
HYPOTHESIS NO. 55

There is no relationship between the job satisfaction of Higher Secondary School teachers and attitude of Higher Secondary teachers towards teaching.

Table: 55

Relation Between The Job Satisfaction Vs Attitude Of Teachers Towards Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CALCULATED CO-EFFICIENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction of teachers</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of teachers Towards teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table value at 0.05 level is 0.113
0.01 level is 0.148

The results obtained in the above table are significant at 0.05 level. Hence the hypothesis No.55 was rejected. An alternative hypothesis, "There is a relationship between the job satisfaction of higher secondary school teachers and attitude of higher secondary school teachers towards teaching.

The calculated co-efficient value is positive. Therefore there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction of teachers and attitude of teachers towards teaching.

This shows that the teachers with better attitude towards teaching are more satisfied in their job. Hence it may be concluded that the teacher with greater job satisfaction has a fatter attitude towards teaching.

In the light of these results summary and conclusions are given in the succeeding chapter.