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3.1. INTRODUCTION

Research is a systematic activity directed towards discovery. The development of an organised body of knowledge has been proved to be an essential and powerful tool in leading man towards progress. In the words of John W. Best (1995) research is the systematic and objective analysis and recording of controlled observations, principles or theories resulting in prediction and possibly ultimate control of events (P. 20).

3.2. METHOD ADOPTED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

Having selected the problem, School Robustness as perceived by English language teachers in relation to their effectiveness, self-esteem and personality, the investigator opts for ‘survey method’, which in his conception will be of more help than other methods of investigation.

3.3. TITLE OF THE STUDY

SCHOOL ROBUSTNESS AS PERCEIVED BY ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN RELATION TO THEIR EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING ENGLISH, SELF-ESTEEM AND PERSONALITY TYPE

3.4. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

School Robustness

By this, the investigator means the score obtained on the School Robustness Inventory structured and validated by D.S.A. Rani (1999).

Effectiveness in Teaching English

By this, the investigator means the score obtained on the Teacher Effectiveness Scale structured and validated by D.S.A. Rani (1999).
Self-esteem

By this, the investigator means the score obtained on the Self-esteem Inventory standardized by Cooper Smith (1967).

Personality Type

By this, the investigator means the score obtained on the Eysenck Personality Inventory.

3.5. OBJECTIVES

PART – I

Section – A

1. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District.
2. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness.
3. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem.
4. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality.
5. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.
6. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.
7. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers.
8. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness.

Section – B

1. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Type of Management.
2. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Nature of School.

3. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Teaching Experience.

4. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

5. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Type of Management.

6. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Nature of School.

7. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

9. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Type of Management.

10. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Nature of School.

11. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Teaching Experience.

12. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

13. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Type of Management.

14. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Nature of School.

15. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Teaching Experience.

16. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

17. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
18. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

19. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

20. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

21. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

22. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

23. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

24. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

25. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Type of Management.

26. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Nature of School.

27. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience.

28. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
29. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

30. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

31. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

32. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

PART – II

Section – A

1. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District.

2. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness.

3. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem.

4. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality.

5. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

6. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

7. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers.

8. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness.
Section – B

1. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Type of Management.
2. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Nature of School.
3. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Teaching Experience.
4. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
5. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Type of Management.
6. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Nature of School.
7. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Teaching Experience.
8. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
9. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Type of Management.
10. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Nature of School.
11. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Teaching Experience.
12. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
13. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Type of Management.
14. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Nature of School.
15. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Teaching Experience.
16. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
17. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
18. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
19. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
20. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
21. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
22. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
23. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
24. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
25. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Type of Management.
26. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Nature of School.
27. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience.

28. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

29. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

30. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

31. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

32. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

Section – C

1. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District.

2. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness.

3. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem.

4. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality.

5. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

6. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

7. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers.
8. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness.

Section – D

1. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Type of Management.

2. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Nature of School.

3. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Teaching Experience.

4. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

5. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Type of Management.

6. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Nature of School.

7. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

9. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Type of Management.

10. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Nature of School.

11. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Teaching Experience.

12. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

13. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Type of Management.
14. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Nature of School.
15. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Teaching Experience.
16. To find the level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
17. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
18. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
19. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
20. To find the significance of difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
21. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
22. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
23. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
24. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
25. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Type of Management.
26. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Nature of School.
27. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience.
28. To find the significance of association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
29. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
30. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
31. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
32. To find the significance of Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools in predicting their perception of School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

PART – III

Section – A

1. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness.
2. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness.
3. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
4. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

5. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

6. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

7. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

9. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

10. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

Section - B

1. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness.

2. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness.

3. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

4. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
5. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

6. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

7. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

9. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

10. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

Section – C

1. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness.

2. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness.

3. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

4. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

5. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
6. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

7. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

9. To find the significance of difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

10. To find the significance of difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

3.6. HYPOTHESES

PART – I

Section – A

1. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District is high.

2. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness is high.

3. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem is high.

4. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality is high.

5. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

6. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

7. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers.
8. Teacher effectiveness, self-esteem and personality of English language teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of school robustness.

Section – B

1. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Type of Management is high.
2. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Nature of School is high.
3. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
4. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
5. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Type of Management is high.
6. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Nature of School is high.
7. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
8. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
9. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Type of Management is high.
10. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Nature of School is high.
11. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
12. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
13. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Type of Management is high.
14. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Nature of School is high.
15. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
16. The level of School Robustness perceived by English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.

17. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

18. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

19. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

20. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

21. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

22. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

23. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

24. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

25. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Type of Management.

26. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Nature of School.
27. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience.

28. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the English Language Teachers in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

29. Teacher Effectiveness, Self-esteem and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

30. Teacher Effectiveness, Self-esteem and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

31. Teacher Effectiveness, Self-esteem and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

32. Teacher Effectiveness, Self-esteem and Personality of English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

**PART – II**

*Section – A*

1. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District is high.

2. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness is high.

3. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem is high.

4. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality is high.

5. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

6. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.
7. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers.
8. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness.

Section – B

1. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Type of Management is high.
2. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Nature of School is high.
3. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
4. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
5. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Type of Management is high.
6. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Nature of School is high.
7. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
8. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
9. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Type of Management is high.
10. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Nature of School is high.
11. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
12. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
13. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Type of Management is high.
14. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Nature of School is high.
15. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Teaching Experience is high.
16. The level of School Robustness perceived by male English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
17. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
18. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
19. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
20. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
21. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
22. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
23. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
24. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the male English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
25. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Type of Management.
26. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Nature of School.

27. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience.

28. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the male English Language Teachers in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

29. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

30. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

31. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

32. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of male English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

Section – C

1. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District is high.

2. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness is high.

3. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem is high.

4. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality is high.

5. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.
6. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness.

7. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers.

8. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness.

Section – D

1. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Type of Management is high.

2. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Nature of School is high.

3. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Teaching Experience is high.

4. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers in secondary schools in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.

5. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Type of Management is high.

6. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Nature of School is high.

7. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Teaching Experience is high.

8. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Teacher Effectiveness in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.

9. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Type of Management is high.

10. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Nature of School is high.

11. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Teaching Experience is high.

12. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different levels of Self-esteem in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.
13. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Type of Management is high.

14. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Nature of School is high.

15. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Teaching Experience is high.

16. The level of School Robustness perceived by female English Language Teachers of different types of personality in terms of Spouse Employment Status is high.

17. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

18. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

19. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

20. There is no significant difference in Effectiveness in Teaching English among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

21. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

22. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

23. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

24. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem among the female English Language Teachers of Low, Average and High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
25. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Type of Management.

26. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Nature of School.

27. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Teaching Experience.

28. There is no significant association between the Personality type and the School Robustness perceived by the female English Language Teachers in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

29. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

30. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

31. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

32. Self-esteem, Teacher Effectiveness and Personality of female English Language Teachers in the secondary schools are not significant predictors of School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

PART – III

Section – A

1. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness.

2. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness.
3. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
4. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
5. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
6. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.
7. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
8. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.
9. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.
10. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Low School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

Section – B

1. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness.
2. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness.
3. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
4. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

5. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

6. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

7. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

9. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

10. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived Average School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

Section – C

1. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness.

2. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness.

3. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.

4. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Type of Management.
5. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

6. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Nature of School.

7. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

8. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Teaching Experience.

9. There is no significant difference in Teacher Effectiveness in English between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

10. There is no significant difference in Self-esteem between male and female English Language Teachers who perceived High School Robustness in terms of Spouse Employment Status.

**3.7. POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

All the students of 9th and 10th standards studying in high and higher secondary schools and their teachers teaching English in Tirunelveli Central Educational District following state board syllabus form the population of the study.

From the population, 145 English language teachers teaching at secondary level and 725 students studying in their classes were taken at random to form the sample of the present investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Government Higher Secondary School, Gangaikondan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Government Higher Secondary School, Reddiarpatti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Government High School, Kodaganallur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>No. of Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Government High School, Suthamalii</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Government High School, Therku Chezhianallur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Government High School, Uthayaneri</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Government High School, Munneerpallam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rani Anna Corporation Girls Hr Secondary School, Pettai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. AVRMV Girls Govt Higher Secondary School, Ambasamudram</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. SMSS Govt Girls’ Higher Secondary School, Senkottai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Kamarajar Corporation Boys’ Higher Secondary School, Pettai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Government Boys’ Higher Secondary School, Kadayanallur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SMSS Govt Boys’ Higher Secondary School, Senkottai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sankar Higher Secondary School, Sankarnagar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Rahmania High Secondary School, Melapalayam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. St. Peter’s Higher Secondary School, Ukkirankottai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Catheiral Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Christu Raja Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Manthiramurthy Higher Secondary School, Tirunelveli Town</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Muslim Boys Higher Secondary School, Melapalayam</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. MDT Boys Higher Secondary School, Tirunelveli</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. MN Abdur Rahman Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Schaffter Boys Higher Secondary School, Tirunelveli</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. St. John’s Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. St. Xavier’s Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. St. Aloysius’ Higher Secondary School, Kallikulam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Senai Thalivar Higher Secondary School, Puliangudi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. CP Athithananar Boys’ Higher Secondary School, Rayagiri</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. St. Arulappar Higher Secondary School, Avudayamur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. St. Irudhaya Higher Secondary School, Mela Ilanthaikulam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Syambulingam Higher Secondary School, TN Puthukudi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Musilim Girls Higher Secondary School, Melapalayam</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Child Jesus Girls Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Fathima Oriental Arabic Girls’ Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School

| No. of Sample | School |  
|---------------|--------|---|
| 2            | Mary Sargent Girls Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai |  
| 2            | Sarah Tucker Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai |  
| 2            | St. Joseph Girls' Higher Secondary School, NGO 'A' Colony |  
| 2            | St. Ignatius’ Convent Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai |  
| 2            | Avaiyar Girls Higher Secondary School, Keelapavur |  
| 2            | St. Annammal Girls Higher Secondary School |  
| 3            | Sarah Matric Higher Sec School, Ariyakulam |  
| 2            | IIPE LN Matric Higher Secondary School, Uthamapandiankulam |  
| 3            | Sri Jayendra Swamigal Golden Jubilee Matriculation Higher Secondary School, Sankarnagar |  
| 3            | Angelo Matric Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai |  
| 2            | Bell Matric Higher Secondary School, Palayamkottai |  
| 3            | Christhu Jothi Higher Secondary School, Munneerppallam |  
| 2            | Little Flower Higher Secondary School, Tirunelveli Town |  
| 3            | St. Francis Xavier Matric Higher Secondary School, Vannarpettai |  
| 2            | Sri Ramakrishna Matric Higher Secondary School, Alangulam |  
| 2            | Merit Matric Higher Secondary School, Ambasamudram |  
| 3            | Sivanthi Matric Higher Secondary School, Cheranmahadevi |  
| 3            | AG Matric Higher Secondary School, Senkottai |  
| 3            | AU Chinmaya Vidyalaya Matriculation H Sec School, Palayamkottai |  
| 2            | Magdalin Matri Higher Secondary School, Rahmathnagar |  
| 145          | Total |  

### 3.8. RESEARCH TOOLS

2. Teacher Effectiveness Scale developed by D.S.A. Rani (1999).
3. Self-Esteem Inventory standardized by Cooper Smith (1967).
4. Eysenck Personality Inventory standardized by Hans J. Eysenck (1975).

### 3.9. ESTABLISHING RELIABILITY

The reliability of the tools was established using test-retest method. The Teacher Effectiveness Scale was first administered to randomly selected 50 high school students, and the other three tools, such as, School Robustness Inventory, Self-esteem Inventory and Eysenck Personality Inventory were administered to 20 English language teachers randomly selected. Then after an interval of two weeks the same tests were administered to the same set of samples. Using the two sets of scores obtained for each one of the
tools, product moment correlations were computed. The obtained correlation coefficients are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Robustness Inventory</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem Inventory</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck Personality Inventory</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the correlation coefficients are positive and significant, they uphold the consistency of the tools. Hence, the tools are taken as reliable. The tools are given in appendix.

3.10. COLLECTION OF DATA

The School Robustness Inventory, Self-esteem Inventory and Eysenck Personality Inventory were administered to 145 English teachers teaching at secondary level working in government, aided and private schools in Tirunelveli Central Educational District after the prior permission from the Heads of the schools. The Teacher Effectiveness Scale was administered to 725 students, i.e., five students for one teacher, studying in the same institution. The investigator explained the tools to the teachers and students personally. They were requested to answer all the statements and return them promptly to the investigator. The filled-in tools were scored and the data were tabulated for analysis.

3.11. STATISTICS USED

The investigator used the following statistical techniques to test the hypotheses:

1. Percentage Analysis
2. ‘t’ Test
3. ANOVA
4. Chi-square Analysis
5. Pearson Product Moment Correlation
6. Regression Analysis
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