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4.1-INTRODUCTION:-

The next steps in the process of research, after the collection of data, are the organization, analysis and interpretation of data and formulation of conclusions and generalizations to get a meaningful picture out of the raw information collected. The analysis and interpretation of data involve the objective material in the possession of the researcher and his subjective reactions and desires to be derived from the data.

The mass data collected through the use of tool need to be systematized and organized, i.e., edited, classified and tabulated before it can serve the purpose. Here, editing implies the checking of gathered data for accuracy, utility and completeness; classifying refers to the dividing of the information into different categories, classes or heads for use; and tabulating denotes the recording of the classified material in accurate mathematical terms, i.e., marking and counting frequency tallies for different items on which information is gathered.

Analysis of data means studying the tabulated material in order to determine inherent facts or meanings. It involves breaking down the existing complex factors into simplex parts and putting the parts together in new arrangements for purposes of interpretation.

As a matter of fact analysis and interpretation are interlinked and interdependent. Sukhia, Mehrotra and Mehrotra (1974) while defining the process of analysis state, "Analysis of data means
studying the tabulated material in order to determine inherent facts or meanings. It involves breaking down existing complex factors into simpler parts and putting the parts together in new arrangements for purposes of interpretation (p.181). "While analyzing his data, an investigator usually makes use of those statistical techniques which are necessary for the purpose of his study and presents the results in an organized and meaningful form. Good, Barr and Scates (1941) while defining the process of interpretation point out, "The process of interpretation is essentially one of stating what the results show. What do they mean? What is their significance? What is the answer to the original problem? This process calls for a critical examination of the results one's analysis in the light of his previous analysis concerning the gathering of data" (p.617)

For the purpose of the present study data were collected through standardizes tool (as cleared in detail in chapter 3rd) Raw data were arranged in logical manner and then statistical treatment was given to all data as all frequencies were managed by using class interval, then the mean standard deviation SED (standard errors of difference) and all essential statistical techniques /formula were used. Assistance of computer was also taken to maintain accuracy and save the time.

On the basis of the objectives and hypothesis of the study t-test was employed to find out the significance of the difference between the two means of contrast groups level of significance was decided 0.05 because in survey type of researches some error in data collection is quite normal. So it was much meaningful to keep yourself confided at 0.05(95% of case show the tendency according to the result of the study) Separate analysis for each group of study is given as fallows:-
4.2- ANALYSIS OF OVER ALL VALUES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER EDUCATORS

To know the difference in the overall values of male and female Teacher Educators, mean score was calculated for both groups and to know the level of significance between both group t-value was calculated. Detail of analyzed data is given in table No 4.1

TABLE NO-4.1
Description of statistics for Male and Female teacher educators in relation to their over all values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>42130</td>
<td>1013216</td>
<td>239.375</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>45062</td>
<td>10864862</td>
<td>239.691</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: As the data given in the table No.4.1 indicates that Male teacher educators (N=176) had (239.375) mean score on overall values, while their counter part female teacher educators (N=187) scored (M=239.691), that data clearly indicates that even at the level of mean score for over all values, male and female teacher educators were not too far to each other. While t-value was calculated then (t=0.172) it had been cleared that, both the group had no significant difference in relation to their overall values (since calculated value-0.172 is less than table value 1.96) Whatever difference is seen in mean score, that might be due to sampling error or some other factors.

So, the 1st Hypothesis of the study that “There is no significance difference between male and female teacher educators in
**relation to their overall values** had been accepted at significant of level .05 levels.

Thus on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that, Male and Female teacher educators had no significant difference in respect to their *over all values*. Thus it also can be said that variable of sex had no role to determined the value pattern in teacher educators.

The findings of the study were opposite to the study conducted by *Tidon sporel Dorothy (1952)* who investigated the sex, difference between men and women students and he found that sex difference existed in the both group in relation to their values (*Tool- All Port- vernon-Lindzey Inventory*).

But that study was conducted on the students while the present one was on teacher educators. In the same way *Bharat Kiran (1980)* studied the social values of the students studying in intermediate class. She found that Boys and girls had significant difference on *over all values*. It means that sex difference lies for *over all values* in case of adolescent students, but at the level of teacher educators this tendency did not exists.

**4.3 ANALYSIS OF AESTHETIC VALUES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER EDUCATORS**

To fulfill the objective of comparison of *Aesthetic values* in between male and female teacher educators mean score of both contrast groups was calculated on the basis of data collected through Teacher values Inventory and finally to find out, whether the seen difference in the means of both group, was significant or not *t-value* was calculated. Statistically analyzed data is shown in details in table No 4.2.
TABLE NO-4.2
Description of statistics for Male and Female teacher educators in relation to their Aesthetic values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5735</td>
<td>189699</td>
<td>32.585</td>
<td>4.016</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6284</td>
<td>213260</td>
<td>33.426</td>
<td>4.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:-**
Result given in table No.4.2 clearly indicates the status of aesthetic values in teacher educators. Male teacher educators (N=176) scored (32.585) points in average while their contrast group (N=187) was in little better position with (33.426) mean score. Though standard deviation of both the groups [male (4.016) and female (4.081)] was not too far from each other, but, when t-value was calculated to know the level of significance between both the means of contrast group for aesthetic value then t-value (1.970) indicated that both means were significantly different to each other. Because the calculated t-value (1.970) was greater than table value (1.96) at the .05 level of significance and at 361 degree of freedom.

So, the 2nd Hypothesis of the study "There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their aesthetic values" had been rejected at .05 level of significance and 361 degree of freedom.

So, on the basis of above discussion and data given in table No 4.2 it
could be inferred that male teacher educator were significantly different to female teacher educators in respect to their Aesthetic values. This difference goes in favors of female teacher educators.

Thus it was inferred that female teacher educators serving in Uttar Pradesh were significantly in better position to their counter part. male teacher educators. Further it was also inferred that Sex (gender) has significant role to determine the aesthetic values in teacher educators.

Findings of the present study in respect to aesthetic values of male and female group, confirms the findings of some researches already conducted on the same line-as Tiden sporel Dorth (1952) conducted a study in which it was found that women of American International college of united state hold significantly higher aesthetic values in comparison to men students.

In the same way, Reddy (1980) in his study explained that girls students of secondary level had significantly better aesthetic values., Although Jain (1982) revealed that teacher with high aesthetic values were not significantly better in their work teacher with high aesthetic values were not significantly better in their work. Baj Pai (1997) also observed values taking the variables of locale and gender. He found that girls high school were better than boys of some group in respect to their aesthetic values.

4.4-ANALYSIS OF THEORETICAL VALUES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER EDUCATORS

To assess the theoretical values among male and female teacher educators, data was collected through a Teacher value inventory and to find out the difference (if any) between both contrasts groups mean
score was calculated separately for both the groups. Finally to find out the level of significance between the means of both groups t-value was calculated, detail of the processed data for theoretical values (comparison) is shown in table No 4.3.

TABLE – 4.3

Description of statistics for male and female teacher educators in relation to their theoretical values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>224369</td>
<td>35.494</td>
<td>3.881</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6644</td>
<td>237980</td>
<td>35.340</td>
<td>4.123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: As the data on theoretical values, given in table 4.3 clearly indicates that Male teacher educators (N=176) were little better (35.494) in comparison to Female (M=187) teacher educators. (M=35.340). Although the mean scores of both contrast group did not show a big difference at a glance, but and t-values (0.365) also indicates that no significant difference exists in the theoretical value of both groups. So, it can be said that there no significant difference in the theoretical values between male and female teacher educators at 0.05 level of significance and at 361 degree of freedom, since calculated t-value is less than table value.

So, the 3rd Hypothesis of the study "There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their theoretical values" was accepted. On the basis of statistical analysis at 0.05 level of significance and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus on the basis of afore said detail it can be inferred that female
teacher educators were not significantly better in *theoretical values* in comparison to their counter part male teacher educators.

The observations of the present study are supporting to the findings of Gaur (1975), who studied values of high school students both girls and boys of the state of Rajasthan. He found that on the theoretical values boys and girls as whole did not differ to each other. But Reddy's (1980) observation was little different to the observation of the present study and study of Gaur (1975). He observed that boys were relatively better in *theoretical values* than the girls student

### 4.5 ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS VALUES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER EDUCATORS

To find out the difference in the *Religious values* of Male and Female teacher educators, mean score was calculated for both groups and to know the level of significance between both groups t-values was calculated. Detail of analyzed data is given in table No 4.4

**TABLE NO 4.4**

*Description of statistics for male and female teacher Educators in relation to their religious values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>227964</td>
<td>35.795</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6603</td>
<td>235888</td>
<td>35.117</td>
<td>4.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETATION: The data given in the table No. 4.5 reveals that Male teacher educators (N-176) had 35.795 mean score on Religious values, while their counterpart female teacher educator (N-178) score M=35.117, the data clearly indicates that even at the level of mean score for Religious values, male and female teacher educator were not too far to each other. While t-values was calculated than (t=1.521) it had been cleared that, both the group had no significant difference in relation to their Religious values (since calculated value-1.521 is less than table value 1.96) Whatever difference is seen in mean scores, that might be due to sampling error or some other factors

So, the 4th hypothesis of the study that “There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their Religious values,” had been accepted at significant of level .05 level.

Thus on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that, Male and Female teacher educators had no significant difference in respect to their Religious values. Thus it also can be said that variable of sex had no role to determined the Religious value pattern in teacher educators.

As the findings of study indicates, no significant difference with regard to sex, but Srivastava, Vinodini (1990) found significant ser difference in relation to religious values but her study was on secondary level students.

Bajpai (1997) also found sex difference (significant) in relation to religious values when he conducted a research on 1070 male and female students of different locale, categories and socioeconomic status. Sigh (1989) also concluded that significant difference exists
between male and female students on religions values. Sex difference in all the cases mentioned was in favor of girls students. But at the levels of teacher educators Sex played no role to determine religious values.

4.6 ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL VALUES IN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER EDUCATORS:

To assess the Political values among male and female teacher educators, data was collected through a Teacher value inventory and to find out the difference (if any) between both contrast groups mean score was calculated separately for both the groups. Finally to find out the level of significance between the means of both groups t-value was calculated, detail of the processed data for Political of values (comparison) is shown in table No 4.5

TABLE-4.5

| Description of statistics for male and female teacher educators in relation to their political values. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | N  | SUM | SUM Sq | Mean | S.D. | df  | t-value |
| Male | 176 | 5649 | 183809 | 32.097 | 3.776 | 361 | 2.504 |
| Female | 187 | 6239 | 210735 | 33.186 | 4.440 |     |         |

INTERPRETATION: As the data on Political values, given in table 4.5 clearly indicates that Female teacher educators (N=187) were little
better (M=33.186) in comparison to Male (M=176) teacher educators. (M=32.097). Although the mean scores of both contrast group did not show a big difference at a glance, but t-values (2.504) indicates that significant difference exists in the Political value of both groups and this difference goes in favors of female teacher educators. So, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the political values between male and female teacher educators at 0.05 level of significance and at 361 degree of freedom, since calculated t-value is greater than table value.

So, the 5th Hypothesis of the study that “There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their Political values” was rejected. On the basis of statistical analysis at 0.05 level of significance and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus on the basis of afore said detail it can be inferred that female teacher educators were significantly better in political values in comparison to their counter part male teacher educators.

So the main finding of the study against the objective No-05 was female teacher educators of U.P were significantly better than male teacher educators in respect to their Political values.

As far the results of other studies regarding the role of sex on political values, are concern then, Singh (1993) found that female adolescent had higher mean score on political values than male adolescents.

Similarly Padamnabhan . T. (1992) studied the values of high school pupils then he found that Boys and girls different significantly in respect to their political values-The same finding in a study was also explained by V.Shrivastave (1990).
Thus it can be conclude that even at the level of teacher educators sex difference lies in relation to their political values.

4.7 ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL VALUES IN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER EDUCATORS:

To assess the Social values among male and female teacher educators, data was collected through a value inventory and to find out the difference (if any) between both contrast groups mean score was calculated separately for both the groups. Finally to find out the level of significance between the means of both groups t-value was calculated, detail of the processed data for Social of values (comparison) is shown in table No 4.6

TABLE 4.6
Description of statistics for Male and Female teacher educators in relation to their social values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D f</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6884</td>
<td>271396</td>
<td>39.114</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7381</td>
<td>293007</td>
<td>39.261</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: As the data on Social values, given in table 4.6 clearly indicates that female teacher educators (N=187) Scored (M=39.216) in average while male (M=176) teacher educators. Scored (M=39.114). The Mean scores of both contrast group did not show a big difference at a glance, and t-values (0.363) also indicates
that significant difference does not exist in the Social values of both groups. So, it can be said that there is no significant difference in the Social values between male and female teacher educators at 0.05 level of significance and at 361 degree of freedom, since calculated t-value is less than table value.

Thus on the basis of afore said detail it can be inferred that female teacher educators were not significantly better in political values in comparison to their counter part male teacher educators.

So, the 6th hypothesis of the study "There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their aesthetic values" was accepted. On the basis of statistical analysis at 0.05 level of significance and 361 degree of freedom.

So the main finding of the study against the objective No-05 was female teacher educators of U.P were not significantly better than male teacher educators in respect to their Social values.

When we discuss the results of the study in light of the other studies then we find that Kiran Bhavati (1980) observed that Boys and girls differ significantly on the mean of social value inventory scores revealing the sex difference. Similarly Srivastava Vinodini (1990) in her study also found that there were significant sex difference in the social values of primary teachers of either sex. Singh (1989) also observed significant difference in social values of the students of graduation level.

Bajpai (1997) had also studied effect of sex on social values but he observed that boys were superior to girls students.
4.8 Analysis of Economic values between Male and Female Teacher Educators

To know the difference in the economic values of Male and Female teacher educators, mean score was calculated for both groups and to know the level of significance t-values was calculated. Detail of analyzed data is given in table No 4.7

TABLE NO. 4.7

Description of statistics for male and female teacher educators in relation to their economic values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5735</td>
<td>189465</td>
<td>32.585</td>
<td>3.846</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6125</td>
<td>202951</td>
<td>32.580</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: As the data given in the table No.4.7 indicates that Male teacher educators (N-176) had M-32.585 mean score on economic values, while their counter part female teacher educator (N-187) score (M=32.580), that data clearly indicates that even at the level of mean score for economic values, male and female teacher educator were not too far to each other. While t-values was calculated then (t-0.013) it had been cleared that, both the group had no significant difference in relation to their overall values (since calculated value-0.013is less than table value 1.96) Whatever difference is seen in mean score, that might be due to sampling error or some other factors.
Thus on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that, Male and Female teacher educators had no significant difference in respect to their values. So it also can be said that variable of sex had no role to determined the economic values pattern in teacher educators.

So, the 7\textsuperscript{th} hypothesis of the study that \textit{"There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their economic values"} had been accepted at significant of level .05 level.

As far the work done on the same line is concerned Padmanabhan. T. (1992), Bajpai (1997) and Reddy (1980) found almost same result, which show significant sex difference in respect to economic values. This difference was in favor of boys.

But teacher educator did not show any significant difference in their economic values when the account of sex was taken under study.

\section*{4.9 Analysis of Hedonistic values between Male and Female Teacher Educators}

To study the \textbf{Hedonistic values} in between male and female teacher educators mean score of both contrast groups was calculated on the basis of data collected through values Inventory Finally to find out, whether the seen difference in the means of both group, was significant or not \textbf{t-value} was calculated. Statistical analysis of the data is shown in details in table No 4.8.
TABLE No. 4.8

Description of statistics for male and female teacher educators in relation to their hedonistic values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5580</td>
<td>179730</td>
<td>31.705</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5787</td>
<td>181795</td>
<td>30.782</td>
<td>4.424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION:- Result given in table No.4.8 clearly indicates the status of Hedonistic values in teacher educators. Male teacher educators (N=176) scored 31.705 points in average while their contrast group (N=187) was in little better position with 30.782 mean score. Though standard deviation of both the groups (male (4.013) and female (4.424) was not too far from each other, but, when t-value was calculated to know the level of significance between both the means of contrast group for Hedonistic values then t-value (2.071) indicated that both means were significantly different to each other. Because the calculated t-value (2.071) was greater than table value (1.96) at the .05 level of significance and at 361 degree of freedom.

So, on the basis of above discussion and data given in table No 4.8 it could be inferred that male teacher educator were significantly different to female teacher educators in respect to their Hedonistic values. This difference was in favors of male teacher educators.

Thus it was inferred that male teacher educators serving in Uttar

Pradesh were significantly in better position to their counter part. Female teacher educators. Further it was also inferred that Sex (gender) has significant role to determine the aesthetic values in teacher educators.

So, the 8th hypothesis of the study “There is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators in relation to their aesthetic values” had been rejected at .05 level of significance.

So the main finding of the study against the objective No 8 was male teacher educators of UP were significantly better than female teacher educators in respects to their hedonistic value.

When we light upon the findings of the other studies regarding the hedonistic values among male and female groups then we find that the similar results on hedonistic values between male and female group were observed by Singh (1989) result of the present study are also verified by the results of Prahraj and Sinha (1973). So after reviewing the results of previous studies also it can be said difference exists in hedonistic values.

4.10- ANALYSIS OF OVER ALL VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Rural and Urban group of the teacher educators were compared to study the over all values, to find out the level of difference between both groups, mean scored were calculated and to know the status of difference whatever the seen difference between means is significant or not t- values was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.9
**TABLE NO-4.9**

Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher Educators in relation to their *over all values*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D f</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>39398</td>
<td>9508550</td>
<td>240.232</td>
<td>16.411</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>47551</td>
<td>11429389</td>
<td>238.950</td>
<td>18.407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:** Analyzed form of the data given in table 4.9 indicates that Rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve (M =240.232) mean scores points for *over all values* while Urban (N=199) teacher educators could get 238.950 mean score. Standard deviation of rural teacher educators (16.411) was less than urban (18.407) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean scores show some difference but t-value (0.691) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at the 0.05 significance level and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 9th of the present study that **"There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their over all values,"** was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural area and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their *over all values*, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the *over all values* in teacher educators.
So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No.9 was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance difference in their over all values and factor of locale did not have significant effect to determine the overall values in teacher educators.

To discuss the results of the present study regarding overall values in teacher educators of rural and urban locale, we have light upon some other studies on the approximately same line. Gaur (1975) observed same results when he compared the value patterns in rural and urban students. Tripathi (1960) also studied students of Dayalbagh (A deemed university, situated in remote of Agra) and city area, then he did not find any significant difference in relation to overall values. So it can be concluded that locale had no significant effect on value pattern of teachers and students.

4.11- ANALYSIS OF AESTHETICS VALUES IN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Aesthetics values of Rural and Urban groups of teacher educators were compared. On the basis of the data collected through Teacher values inventory, to find out the level of difference between both groups, mean scored were calculated and to know the status of difference whether the seen difference between means is significant or not t-values was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.10

| TABLE NO -4.10 |

Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher Educators in relation to their Aesthetics values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5377</td>
<td>178885</td>
<td>32.787</td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6608</td>
<td>222818</td>
<td>33.206</td>
<td>4.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETATION:-

Analyzed from of the data given in table 4.10 indicates that rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve (M= 32.787) mean scores for aesthetics values while urban (N=199) teacher educators could get (M= 33.206) mean score standard deviation of rural teacher educators (3.987) was less than urban (4.139) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean scores show some difference but t-value (0.974) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at the 0.05 significance level. And 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 10th of the present study "There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their aesthetic values," was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural area and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their Aesthetics values, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the Aesthetics values in teacher educators.

So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No.10 was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance difference in their over all values and factor of locale did not have significant affect to determine the overall values in teacher educators.

The results of the present study do not verify the results of some other studies which were conducted on students, but none of them on teachers. Tripathi (1966) found, locale to be effective to determine aesthetic values among the students. But Singh (1989), Reddy (1975) found results opposite to the present study. Mean while Jain (1982) observed the same results as observed in the present study on aesthetic values.
4.12- ANALYSIS OF THEORETICAL VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Theoretical values of rural and urban groups of teacher educators were compared. On the basis of the data collected through Teacher values inventory, to find out the level of difference between both groups, mean scores were calculated and to know the status of difference whether the seen difference between means is significant or not t-value was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.11

Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher Educators in relation to their Theoretical values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NO-4.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION:-

Analyzed form of the data given in table 4.11 indicates that rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve (35.683)mean scores for Theoretical values while urban (N=199) teacher educators could get (35.191)mean score standard deviation of rural teacher educators (3.870) was less than urban (4.115) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean scores show some difference but t-value (1.161) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at
the 0.05 significance level. and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 11th of the present study that There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their Theoretical values, was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural area and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their Theoretical values, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the Theoretical values in teacher educators.

So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No.11 was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance difference in their Theoretical values and factor of locale did not have significant effect to determine the Theoretical values in teacher educators.

Theoretical values in teacher educators of rural and urban locale were not similar to their same group as reported by Reddy (1930) who found rural students better (significantly) than urban students on theoretical values. But Gaur (1975) found that theoretical values in rural/urban students were not significantly different.

Bajpai (1997) observed that rural students of secondary level were significantly better than urban students. When compared on theoretical values. So there is a great need to re-study the theoretical values among teachers and teacher educators.

4.13- ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Religious values of rural and urban teacher educators were
significant role to determine the religious values in teacher educators.

So it can be said that 12th hypothesis of the study “There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their Religious values” so the hypothesis no 12 of the study is rejected at the 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore, main findings of the present study against the objective No-12 was rural teacher educators had significantly better religious values rather than urban teacher educators and status of locale played significant role to determine religious values in teacher educators.

By the most of studies it has been shown that rural group of students/teachers have significantly better religious values. In comparison to urban group. The findings of Tripath (1966), Bajpai (1975), Singh (1989) Reddy (1980) and Singh (1993) show same results as the result of present study on account of the effect of locale on religious values. But Gaur (1975) did not find a significant effect of locale on religious values in his study

4.14- ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Teacher educators of rural and urban locale were compared to study the Political values, to find out the level of significance difference between both groups, mean scored was calculated and to know the status of difference whatever the seen difference between means is significant or not t-values was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.13
Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher Educators in relation to their *Political values*

**TABLE NO. 4.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5289</td>
<td>172821</td>
<td>32.250</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6571</td>
<td>220939</td>
<td>33.020</td>
<td>4.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:**

Analyzed form of the data given in table 4.13 indicates that rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve 32.250 mean scores for Political values while urban (N=199) teacher educators could get(33.020)mean score standard deviation of rural teacher educators (3.716) was less than urban (4.474) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean scores show some difference but t-value (1.755) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at the 0.05 significance level. And 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 13th of the present study "*There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their Political values,*" was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural area and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their Political values, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the Political values in teacher educators..
So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No.4.13 was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance difference in their Political values and factor of locale did not have significant affect to determine the Political values in teacher educators.

As far the researches on political values are concerned. It has been observed that variety of observation have been obtained by different researchers. *As Gaur (1975)* has got those results which are supporting to the results of the present study.

But *Singh (1993) and Bajpai (1997)* found that urban group of student was significantly better than rural students But Reddy (1980) observed that rural group of students were significantly better in political values. So to see the variety of observation there is a great need to go with some other studies on the same line.

**4.15- ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS**

Rural and Urban of group of the teacher educators were compared to study the Social values, to find out the level of difference between both groups, mean scored was calculated and to know the status of difference whether the seen difference between mean is significant or not t- values was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.14
Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their *Social values*

**Table No-4.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>6421</td>
<td>253389</td>
<td>39.152</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>7805</td>
<td>309493</td>
<td>39.221</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:** Analyzed form of the data given in table 4.14 indicates that rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve (39.152) mean score for Social values while urban (N=199) teacher educators could get (39.221) mean score. Standard deviation of rural teacher educators (3.495) was less than urban (4.127) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean score show some difference but t-value (0.168) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at the 0.05 significance level and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 14th of the present study that "There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their Social values", was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.
So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural area and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their Social values, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the Social values in teacher educators.

So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No. 14 was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance difference in their Social values and factor of locale did not have significant affect to determine the Social values in teacher educators.

When the results of present study in the light of observations of other studies, were analyzed then, it was found that a few studies were supporting to the results of the present one as- Bajpai (1997), who also did not find factor of locale to be effective to determine the social values in both the groups.

But Gaur (1975) observed in his study that urban group of students was significantly better in social than rural students, meanwhile Sigh (1993) and Reddy (1980) obtained results which were opposite to that of Singh and Reddy. they found rural students significantly better than urban on social values.

4.16- ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Teacher educators of rural and urban locale were compared to study the Economic values, to find out the level of difference between both groups, mean scored was calculated and to know the status of difference whether the seen difference between means is significant or not t- values was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.15
Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher Educators in relation to their Economic values

TABLE NO-4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5357</td>
<td>177235</td>
<td>32.665</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6468</td>
<td>213956</td>
<td>32.503</td>
<td>4.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: Analyzed form of the data given in table 4.15 indicates that rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve 32.665 mean scores for Economic values, while urban (N=199) teacher educators could get 32.503 mean score standard deviation of rural teacher educators (3.716) was less than urban (4.340) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean scores show some difference but t-value (0.377) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at the 0.05 significance level, and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 15th of the present study that "There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their Economic values" was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural area and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their Economic values, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the Economic values, in teacher educators.

So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No. 15th was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance
difference in their Economic values, and factor of locale did not have significant effect to determine the Economic values, in teacher educators.

Findings of other studies on economic values, in respect to the effect of locale clearly indicates that *Bajpai (1992) and Gaur (1975)* found similar results as the results of the present one but reddy (1980) observed that rural student were significantly different to urban students with much more economic values. In this line observation to that of Reddy. So the researcher suggests much more verification of the results of the study.

4.17- ANALYSIS OF HEDONISTIC VALUES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS

Hedonistic values of rural and urban groups of teacher educators were compared. On the basis of the data collected trough values inventory to find out the level of difference between both groups, mean scored were calculated and to know the status of difference whether the seen difference between means is significant or not t-values was calculated. Details of analyzed data is shown in table no 4.16

Description of statistics for rural and urban teacher Educators in relation to their *Hedonistic values*

| TABLE NO-4.16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Locality | N  | SUM | SUM Sq | Mean | S.D. | df  | t-value |
| Rural    | 164 | 5195| 167297  | 31.677| 4.097| 361  | 1.857   |
| Urban    | 199 | 6138| 193072  | 30.844| 4.352|       |         |
INTERPRETATION:
Analyzed from the data given in table 16th indicates that rural teacher educators (N=164) could achieve (31.677) mean scores for Hedonistic values while urban (N=199) teacher educators could get 30.844 mean score standard deviation of rural teacher educators (4.097) was less than urban (4.352) teacher educators. So the S.D and mean scores show some difference but t-value (1.857) indicates that both groups were not significantly different to each other even at the 0.05 significance level and 361 degree of freedom.

Thus, hypothesis No 16th of the present study that "There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher educators in relation to their Hedonistic values," was accepted even at 0.05 level of significance.

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be inferred that teacher educators belonging to rural and urban area did not have significant difference in relation to their Hedonistic values, therefore, it also can be said that factor of locale does not affects the Hedonistic values in teacher educators.

So, the main findings of the present study against the objective No. 16 was rural and urban teacher educators had no significance difference in their Hedonistic values and factor of locale did not have significant effect to determine the Hedonistic values in teacher educators.

Present result of the study is supporting to the observation of Singh (1990) who found no significant difference in hedonistic values among rural and urban students.
But Tripathi (1966) and Verma (1972) observed that urban groups of students were significantly much more than rural groups of students. It means they found locale to be effective in respect to the hedonistic values. But there is a great need to verification of the result.

**4.18 ANALYSIS OF OVER ALL VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

Comparison of teaching experience factor in relation to the **over all values** between two groups (one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience) was studied by calculating mean scores of the groups of teacher educators having more than six years teaching experience and less than six years teaching experience. Both means were further studied by using t-value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t-value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.17

**Description of statistics for over all values of Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience.**

**TABLE NO-4.17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>45393</td>
<td>10900071</td>
<td>238.911</td>
<td>17.091</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>41556</td>
<td>10037868</td>
<td>240.208</td>
<td>18.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETATION:

We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the *overall value* between teacher educators of two contrast groups the teacher educators much teaching experience (N-173) scored (M-240.208.) mean score points with (18.008) standard deviation while their counterpart (less teaching experience teacher educators (N-190) achieved (M-238.911) mean scored with 17.091 standard deviation. The t- value clearly indicates (t-0.702) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their *overall values*.

Thus on the basis of t- value (0.702) 17th *hypothesis* of the study that "*There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher educators having less than six years of experience and more than six years of experience, in relation to their overall values*" had been accepted even at the0.05 level of significance. (since the calculated values less than table value for 361 degree of freedom and 0.05 level of significance 1.96)

The main finding of the present study against the objective no 17 was over all values of teacher educators were not affected by experience.

So, the discussion revels that teacher educators of much and less experience did not have significant difference in relation to their overall values. Further, it can be inferred that experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the over all values in teacher educators
4.19- ANALYSIS OF AESTHETIC VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

To study the teaching experience effect on aesthetic values mean score was calculated for contrast group of teacher educators one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience. Both means were further studied by using t-value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t-value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.18

Description of statistics for Aesthetic values Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience

Table No. 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6297</td>
<td>211459</td>
<td>33.142</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5688</td>
<td>190244</td>
<td>32.879</td>
<td>4.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the Aesthetic values between teacher educators of two contrast groups the teacher educators having much teaching experience (N-173) scored M-32.879Mean scored points with 4.334standard deviation while their counterpart (less experience teacher educators (N-190) achieved (M-32.879) mean score with
3.824 standard deviation. The t-value clearly indicates (t=0.614) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their Aesthetic values.

Thus on the basis of t-value (0.614) 18th hypothesis of the study that “There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher educators having less than six years teaching experience and more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their Aesthetic values” had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance. (since the calculated value less than table value for 361 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance 1.96)

So, the discussion revels that teacher educators of much and less teaching experience did not have significant difference in relation to their Aesthetic values. Further, it can be inferred that teaching experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the Aesthetic values in teacher educators.

The main findings of the present study against the objective no 18th was Aesthetic values of teacher educators were not affected by teaching experience.

4.20- ANALYSIS OF THEORETICAL VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Comparison of teaching experience factor in relation to the Theoretical values between two groups (one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience) was studied by calculating mean scores of the groups of teacher educators having more than six years teaching experience and less than six years teaching experience. Both means
were further studied by using t-value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t-value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.19

Description of statistics for Theoretical values of Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience

TABLE NO-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6739</td>
<td>241989</td>
<td>35.468</td>
<td>3.962</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6116</td>
<td>219064</td>
<td>35.353</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION:

We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the Theoretical values between teacher educators of two contrast groups. The teacher educators having much teaching experience (N-173) scored (M-35.353) mean score points with 4.069 standard deviation while their counterpart (less teaching experience teacher educators (N-190) achieved (M-35.468) mean score with 3.962 standard deviation. The t-value clearly indicates (t-0.274) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their
Theoretical values.

Thus on the basis of t-value (0.274) 19th hypothesis of the study that "There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher educators having less than six years teaching experience and more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their theoretical values. had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance. (since the calculated values less than table value for 361 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance 1.96)

So, the discussion reveals that teacher educators of much and less teaching experience did not have significant difference in relation to their theoretical values. Further, it can be inferred that teaching experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the theoretical values in teacher educators.

So, the main findings of the present study against the objective no 20th was over all values of teacher educators were not affected by teaching experience.

4.21- ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE:-

To study The teaching experience effect on Religious values mean score was calculated for contrast group of teacher educators one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience. Both means were further studied by using t-value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t-value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.20.
Description of statistics for *Religious values* Teacher Educators having more than six years and less than six years of teaching experience

**TABLE NO-4.20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6742</td>
<td>242440</td>
<td>35.484</td>
<td>4.118</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6123</td>
<td>220043</td>
<td>35.393</td>
<td>4.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:**

We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the *Religious values* between teacher educators of two contrast groups the teacher educators having much teaching experience (N=173) scored M=35.393, mean score points with (4.401) standard deviation while their counterpart (less experienced teacher educators (N=190) achieved (m=35.484) mean scored with (4.118) standard deviation. The t-value clearly indicates (t=0.203 that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their *Religious values*.

Thus on the basis of t-value (0.203) 21st hypothesis of the study that "There is no significant difference between the group of teacher educators having less than six years of teaching experience and more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their Religious values." had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance. (since the calculated values less than table value for 361 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance i.e 1.96
So, the discussion reveals that teacher educators of much and less teaching experience did not have significant difference in relation to their Religious values. Further, it can be inferred that teaching experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the Religious values in teacher educators.

So, the main finding of the present study against the objective no 20th was Religious values of teacher educators were not affected by teaching experience.

4.22 ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Comparison of teaching experience factor in relation to the Political values between two groups (one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience) was studied by calculating mean scores of the groups of teacher educators having more than six years teaching experience and less than six years teaching experience. Both means were further studied by using t-value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t-value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.21.

Description of statistics for Political values Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table NO-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETATION: We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the Political values between teacher educators of two contrast groups. The teacher educators having much teaching experience (N=173) scored M=32.671 mean score points with (4.334) standard deviation while their counterpart (less experience teacher educators (N=190) achieved M=32.674 mean score with (4.009) standard deviation. The t-value clearly indicates (t=0.007) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their Political values.

Thus on the basis of t-value (0.007) 21st hypothesis of the study that "There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher educators having less than six years teaching of experience and having more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their Political values" had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance. (since the calculated value is less than table value for 361 degree of freedom and 0.05 level of significance(e1.96)

So, the discussion revels that teacher educators of much and less teaching experience did not have significant difference in relation to their Political values. Further, it can be inferred that teaching experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the Political values in teacher educators.

So the main finding of the present study against the objective no 21st was Political values of teacher educators were not affected by experience.

4.23- ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE
To, study teaching experience effect on Social values mean score
was calculated for contrast group of teacher educators one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience. Both means were further studied by using t- value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t- value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.22

**Description of statistics for Social values Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience**

**TABLE NO-4.22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7384</td>
<td>290186</td>
<td>38.863</td>
<td>4.128</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>1.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6842</td>
<td>272696</td>
<td>39.549</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:** We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the Social values between teacher educators of two contrast groups the teacher educators having much teaching experience (N-173 ) scored M-39.549. mean score points with 3.495standard deviation while their counterpart (less teaching experience teacher educators (N-190) achieved (M-38.863) mean scored with 4.128 standard deviation. The t- value clearly indicates (t-1.696) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their Social values

Thus on the basis of t- value (1.696) 22th hypothesis of the study that "There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher
educators having less than six years teaching experience and having more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their Social values” had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance. (Since the calculated value less than table value for 361 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance.96)

So, the discussion reveals that teacher educators of much and less teaching experience did not have significant difference in relation to their Social values. Further, it can be inferred that teaching experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the Social values in teacher educators.

So the main finding of the present study against the objective no 22nd was Social values of teacher educators were not affected by teaching experience.

4.24 ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Comparison of teaching experience factor in relation to the Economic values between two groups (one having less than six years teaching experience and another with more than six years teaching experience) was studied by calculating mean scores of the groups of teacher educators having more than six years teaching experience and less than six years teaching experience. Both means were further studied by using t-value to know whether, both the groups had significant difference or not. Detail of means S.D and t-value for interpretation of the status is shown in table No 4.23
Description of statistics for Economic values Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience

TABLE NO-4.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6175</td>
<td>203515</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>187676</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION: We can explain the effect of teaching experience factor in relation to the Economic values between teacher educators of two contrast groups the teacher educators having much teaching experience (N-173) scored M-32.659 mean scored points with (4.281) standard deviation while their counterpart (less experience teacher educators (N-190) achieved (M-32.500) mean scored with (3.868) standard deviation. The t-value clearly indicates (t-0.371) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their Economic values.

Thus on the basis of t-value (0.371) 23rd hypothesis of the study that "There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher educators having less than six years teaching experience and having more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their Economic values" had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance. (since the calculated value less than table value for 361 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance 1.96

So, the discussion revels that teacher educators of much and less
teaching experience did not have significant difference in relation to their *Economic values*. Further, it can be inference that teaching experience factors did not play any significant role to determine the *Economic values* in teacher educators.

So, the main finding of the present study against the objective no 23 was *Economic values* of teacher educators were not affected by teaching experience.

### 4.25-ANALYSIS OF HEDONISTIC VALUES BETWEEN TEACHER EDUCATORS HAVING MORE THAN SIX YEARS AND LESS THAN SIX YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.

Comparison of *hedonistic values* between teacher educators having more than six years and less than six years of teaching experience was done through comparison of mean scores and than to know the level of significance between both means t-value was calculated. Description of analyzed data is shown in table No 4.24.

**Description of statistics for Hedonistic values Teacher Educators having more than six years and having less than six years of teaching experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>SUM Sq</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 years</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5848</td>
<td>183316</td>
<td>30.799</td>
<td>4.192</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5485</td>
<td>177053</td>
<td>31.705</td>
<td>4.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION:**

Table 4.24 reveals that teacher educators having more than six years teaching experience (N=173) could get 31.705 mean scores with (4.279) standard deviation. While their counterpart, teacher educators
having less than six years of teaching experience got 30.799 mean score with (4.192) standard deviation in relation to hedonistic values. While we see the data at a glance than mean scores of both groups do not show much difference, but t-value (2.076) clearly indicates that, both means were significantly different to each other and this difference was in favour of teacher educators having more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their hedonistic values.

Thus it also can be inferred that the factor of experience significantly affects to the hedonistic values among the teacher educators So, the above analysis reveals that 25th Hypothesis of the present study “There is no significant difference between the groups of teacher educators having less than six years teaching experience and having more than six years of teaching experience, in relation to their hedonistic values.” had been rejected at the 0.05 level of significance and 361 degree of freedom because calculated t-value (2.076) is greater than table value (1.96)

So, on the basis of above discussion it can be interred that much experience teacher educators were significantly better than less experience teacher educators in relation to their hedonistic values.

Therefore, the main finding of the present study against the objective No 24, was much experienced (more than six year) teacher educators were significantly better in hedonistic values, than less experienced (less than six years) teacher educators-further, it was also inferred that teaching experience factors plays significant role to determine hedonistic values among teacher educators.

-----☆-----