6.1 Introduction
To find out effectiveness of an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students was the purpose of the study. Construction and finalization (with experts’ comments & suggestions) of Educational Program and Professional Sensitivity Measurement Situation Test was phase – 1 whereas its implementation was phase – 2 of this research study. This chapter helps to get overview of this research study. This chapter focuses on the findings, implications, observations, suggestions and recommendations for prospective researches.

6.2 Summary
It is as follows:

6.2.1 Title
CONSTRUCTION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING PROFESSIONAL SENSITIVITY IN B.ED. STUDENTS

6.2.2 Objectives
Following were objectives:

A) Task Objectives:
   1. To construct an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students.
   2. To implement the educational program.
   3. To construct a test for measuring professional sensitivity.

B) Research Objectives:
   1. To study the effectiveness of an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students.
   2. To study the effectiveness of an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students in relation to gender.
3. To study the effectiveness of an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students in relation to area.

4. To study the effectiveness of an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students in relation to their stream (Science, Commerce, Arts).

5. To study the effectiveness of an educational program for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students in relation to their qualification (Graduate, Post Graduate)

6.2.3 Variables

The variables were as given below:

A) Independent variables

1) Educational Program
2) Gender: (i) Male (ii) Female
3) Area: (i) Urban (ii) Rural
4) Stream: (i) Science (ii) Commerce (iii) Arts
5) Qualification: (i) Graduate (ii) Post graduate

B) Dependent Variable

• Scores on Professional Sensitivity Measurement Situation Test

C) Control Variables

1) B.Ed. students
2) Medium: Gujarati
3) Private B.Ed. college

6.2.4 Hypotheses

The following were the null hypotheses of the present study.

1. No significant difference will be there between between mean scores of pre test and post test on Professional Sensitivity Measurement Situational Test (PSMST) of experimental group.

2. No significant difference will be there between between mean score of pre test and post test on PSMST of control group.

3. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of experimental group and control group.
4. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of male students of experimental group.

5. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of female students of experimental group.

6. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of male students and female students of experimental group.

7. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of male students of experimental group and control group.

8. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of female students of experimental group and control group.

9. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of students from urban area of experimental group.

10. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of students from rural area of experimental group.

11. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of students from urban and rural area of experimental group.

12. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of students from urban area of experimental group and control group.

13. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of students from rural area of experimental group and control group.

14. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of science stream students of experimental group.

15. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of commerce stream students of experimental group.

16. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of arts stream students of experimental group.

17. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of science stream students of experimental group and control group.

18. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of commerce stream students of experimental group and control group.

19. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of arts stream students of experimental group and control group.
20. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of graduate students of experimental group.

21. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of post graduate students of experimental group.

22. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of graduate and post graduate students of experimental group.

23. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of graduate students of experimental group and control group.

24. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of post graduate students of experimental group and control group.

6.2.5 Population and Sample
The study was carried out with B.Ed. students. The population consisted of B.Ed. students of Gujarati Medium Colleges of Ahmedabad district of Gujarat state. Two B.Ed. colleges of Ahmedabad city were selected by purposive sampling method for the present study. They were consisted of 100 students. Vision College of Education, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad was selected as an experimental group and Shree Umiya College of Education, C.T.M. Ahmedabad was considered as a control group.

6.2.6 Tools
The following tools were constructed by the investigator for the present research.

1. Questionnaire:
Various materials on sensitivity, types of sensitivity and related information were referred by the investigator. In a way, the components of professional sensitivity were analyzed. A list of a few components which are important in development of professional sensitivity was made accordingly. A questionnaire of all the listed components developed for the lecturers of B.Ed. or M.Ed. colleges. On the basis of their feedback, the components were selected. Taking their suggestions into consideration, the PSMST was developed based on the selected components.

2. Educational Program:
With the help of the guide as well as experts the investigator had developed an educational program to develop professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students. Ten different activities were selected and implemented on B.Ed. students of the year 2012-2013.
3. **Professional Sensitivity Measurement Situational Test (PSMST):**

The study checked the effectiveness of the educational program. PSMST was constructed for this purpose. Students of experimental group were put in a particular situation and asked for choosing one of the options given in the test. There were 30 such statements of different situations in the test. Score for each option was decided with the help of experts. Calculation was made according to the selection of the most appropriate option by a student as 4 then 3, 2, and 1.

4. **Feedback form**

In order to study the feedback of students towards the developed educational program with reference to their learning experiences, a feedback form was constructed and was given to students at the end of the selected activities. It contained close-ended items. These items were based on classroom environment, increase in knowledge, and change in one’s personality, implementation of educational activities, personal feelings and experience while experiencing such environment.

6.2.7 **Research Design**

The present study was an experimental study with **Quasi-Experimental Design** where it followed two group pre - post test design. The investigator worked with an experimental group and a control group. Educational program was implemented on students of B.Ed. college and situational test was administered as pre and post test to find out the effectiveness of the educational program.

6.2.8 **Data Collection**

The educational program and situational test were developed by the investigator and was given to the experts for their suggestions and comments. Task based on learning package were implemented. After implementation of different activities, students’ feedback was collected. The students of Vision College of Education, Navarangpura, Ahmedabad were selected as an experimental group and Shree Umiya College of Education, C.T.M. Ahmedabad was considered as a control group. Professional Sensitivity Measurement Situational Test (PSMST) was administered as pre and post test to study the effectiveness of educational program. Feedback form was also developed and used for data collection.
6.2.9. Data Analysis

Collected data through pre and post test (PSMST) was analyzed statistically using t-test, and the data collected through feedback form were analyzed using percentage technique.

6.2.10 Results of Hypotheses Testing

Results obtained after testing the hypotheses are presented below:

Table 6.1

Results of Hypotheses Testing using t – test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>Rejected / Not rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on Professional Sensitivity Measurement Situational Test (PSMST) of experimental group.</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean score of pre test and post test on PSMST of control group.</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between the mean scores of post-test on PSMST of Experimental and control group of students.</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of male students of experimental group.</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of female students of experimental group.</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>male and female students of experimental group.</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of male students of experimental and control group.</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of female students of experimental and control group.</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of students from urban area of experimental group.</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of students from rural area of experimental group.</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of students from urban and rural area of experimental group.</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of students from urban area of experimental group and control group.</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post test on PSMST of students from rural area of experimental group and control group.</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between mean scores of pre test and post test on PSMST of science stream students of experimental group.

15. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre-test and post-test on PSMST of commerce stream students of experimental group. 6.68 0.01 Rejected

16. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre-test and post-test on PSMST of arts stream students of experimental group. 9.82 0.01 Rejected

17. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre-test and post-test on PSMST of arts stream students of experimental group. 3.07 0.01 Rejected

18. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of commerce stream students of experimental group and control group. 7.72 0.01 Rejected

19. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of arts stream students of experimental group and control group. 9.42 0.01 Rejected

20. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre-test and post-test on PSMST of graduate students of experimental group. 7.85 0.01 Rejected

21. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of pre-test and post-test on PSMST of post graduate students of experimental group. 10.91 0.01 Rejected
22. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of graduate and post graduate students of experimental group.  

23. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of graduate students of experimental and control group.

24. No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of post graduate students of experimental and control group.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of graduate and post graduate students of experimental group.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of graduate students of experimental and control group.</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>No significant difference will be there between mean scores of post-test on PSMST of post graduate students of experimental and control group.</td>
<td>10.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Findings

Following are the findings of the present study:

1. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of Experimental group was significant and is in favor of post test. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among B.Ed. students of experimental group.

2. The difference between mean score of pre and post test of control group was not significant. It means traditional way was not effective to develop professional sensitivity among B.Ed. students of control group.

3. Experimental group students’ post test mean score was significantly higher than those of students of control group. It means developing professional sensitivity through educational program was more effective than traditional way among B.Ed. Students.

4. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of male students of Experimental group was significant and it is in favor of post test. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among male B.Ed. students.

5. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of female students of experimental group was significant and which was in favor of post test. It means
professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among female B.Ed. students.

6. The difference between the mean score of post test score of male and female students of experimental group was not significant. It means male and female students did not differ in effectiveness of Professional sensitivity. Professional Sensitivity Program was equally helpful to develop professional sensitivity among male and female students of experimental group.

7. The difference between the mean score of post test of male students of experimental group and control group was significant which was in favor of experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among male students of experimental group.

8. The difference between the mean score of post test score of female students of Experimental group and control group was significant which was in favor of experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among female students.

9. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of urban area students of Experimental group was significant which is in favor of post test score. It means professional sensitivity development program is effective to develop professional sensitivity among urban area students of experimental group.

10. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of rural area students of Experimental group was significant which is in favor of post test score. It means professional sensitivity development program is effective to develop professional sensitivity among rural area students of experimental group.

11. The difference between the mean score of post test score of urban and rural area’s students of Experimental group was not significant. It means urban and rural students of experimental group did not differ in effectiveness of Professional sensitivity. Professional Sensitivity Program was equally helpful to develop professional sensitivity among urban and rural students of experimental group.

12. The difference between the mean score of post test of urban area’s students of experimental group and control group was significant which was in favor of post test score of experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among urban area’s students of experimental group.
13. The difference between the mean score of post test of rural area’s students of experimental group and control group was significant which was in favor of post test score of experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among rural area’s students of experimental group.

14. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of Science stream students of Experimental group was significant which was in favor of post test. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among Science stream students of experimental group.

15. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of Commerce stream students of Experimental group was significant which was in favor of post test. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among Commerce stream students of experimental group.

16. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of Arts stream students of Experimental group was significant which was in favor of post test. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among Arts stream students of experimental group.

17. The difference between the mean score of post test of Science stream students of Experimental group and control group was significant. It was in favor of Experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among Science stream students of experimental group.

18. The difference between the mean score of post test of Commerce stream students of Experimental group and control group was significant. It was in favor of Experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among Commerce stream students of experimental group.

19. The difference between the mean score of post test of Arts stream students of Experimental group and control group was significant. It was in favor of Experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among Arts stream students of experimental group.

20. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of graduate students of experimental group was significant which is in favor of post test. It means
professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among graduate students of experimental group.

21. The difference between the mean score of pre and post test of post graduate students of experimental group was significant which is in favor of post test. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among post graduate students of experimental group.

22. The difference between the mean score of post test score of graduate and post graduate students of experimental group was not significant. It means graduate and post graduate students of experimental group did not differ in effectiveness of Professional sensitivity. Professional Sensitivity Program was equally helpful to develop professional sensitivity among graduate and post graduate students of experimental group.

23. The difference between the mean score of post test score of graduate students of experimental group and control group was significant which was in favor of post test score of experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among graduate students of experimental group.

24. The difference between the mean score of post test score of post graduate students of experimental group and control group was significant which was in favor of post test score of experimental group. It means professional sensitivity development program was effective to develop professional sensitivity among post graduate students of experimental group.

**Students’ feedback about the Meeting and Discussion activity:**

Feedbacks from the students were asked at the end of the experts’ talk and discussion. Following was the conclusion of the feedback taken from the students regarding the activity.

1. All the three speeches and discussion were found inspirational to the students.
2. Time taken by the speaker in their speech was found appropriate to the students.
3. Interest of the students was maintained 95% during the speech and discussion.
4. Speech 2 was found the best to the students.
5. None of the speech was boring to students.
6. In speech 1 and 3, 87% and 92% students found enough time for question answer session but 90% found less time in speech 2.
7. All the students got new vision for their life as a teacher as well as specific information about being a good teacher.

8. Question answer session of speech 2 was found interesting to the students most and got 85% feedback in it. Rest of the speeches was found interesting.

9. Resolutions taken by students at the end of each speech were effective, impressive and sensitive.

10. The effect of the speakers was found on students resolutions.

6.4 Implications

Following are the educational implications of the present study:

Educational Program can be used to

1. Develop professional sensitivity among B.Ed. students.

2. Equip them with a different experience of being a teacher by implementing activities.

3. Develop or enhance their thinking process about a teacher and their responsibilities.

4. Focus on the application of knowledge in dealing with real situations.

6.5 Observations

1. Students found the educational program very interesting.

2. Students were found excited to participate and enjoyed activities done in educational program.

3. Students were found cooperative while working with peers to fulfill the tasks.

4. Students could complete the tasks in the given time.

5. Students’ active participation and involvement in the program was found throughout.

6. Students became more serious about the profession they chose after implementation of the educational program.

7. Students decided to do their level best in this profession and are willing to satisfy all with their work.

8. Students appreciated the activities presented through work-sheets, audio-video inputs, meetings with well known educationist etc.

9. Students’ response towards the educational program was found quite positive.
6.6. Suggestions
1. Developing professional sensitivity in the pre service teachers will help a lot.
2. The program will help the teacher educators to implement this program in their institution for developing professional sensitivity in B.Ed. students. They can also include the program in their annual planning from the beginning of the year.
3. The program will help the policy makers to include the activities proved to be effective at the end of the experiments for developing professional sensitivity for B.Ed. curriculum and textbooks.
4. Professional sensitivity measurement test can be constructed which will help B.Ed. Institutions to measure the professional sensitivity of their students.

6.7. Recommendations for further studies
1. A study could be conducted on standardization of the educational program.
2. A study could be conducted on factors affecting professional sensitivity in B.Ed. Students.
3. A study could be conducted on development and tryout of such educational program in other level of students.
4. Similar study could be conducted for English medium B.Ed. students.
5. A study could be conducted with other variables than used in the present study.