CHAPTER – IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0.0 INTRODUCTION:

In the preceding chapters theoretical framework of the problem, operationalisation of variables, review of relevant literature, the description of tools used and method of study have been discussed. In this chapter, an attempt has been made to present the results emerging from the analysis of the data. In order to give the present study a meaningful and scientific way, the data were subjected to appropriate statistical procedure. According to Chatfield (1985), “Statistics is much more than a collection of standard prescriptions”. He further states that it includes, “(i) Clarify the objectives of the investigation, (ii) Collect the data in an appropriate way, (iii) Investigate the structure and quality of the data, (iv) Carry out an initial examination of the data, (v) Select and carry out an appropriate formal statistical analysis, (vi) Compare the findings with previous results or acquire further data if necessary and (vii) Interpret and communicate the results”.

4.1.0 ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

In this Chapter are given the results of the study related to the various objectives and hypotheses of the study. The results pertaining to all the objectives and hypotheses are given in the following tables:

Objective (O₁)

To compare the difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions.
Hypothesis (H₁)

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions.

Table-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>314.09</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>271.50</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that ‘t’ value (9.11 for df 1/198) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators and Self-financed teacher educator is significant at 0.01 level. The mean of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators of Government teacher education institutions is higher than the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. When the teaching effective was compared in the case of Government teacher educators (M=314.09), it was found that the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean teaching effectiveness (271.50). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions”
stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Objective (O₂)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

**Hypothesis (H₂)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

**Table-2**

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>289.55</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>234.62</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that ‘t’ value (26.19 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators and Self-financed teacher
educators having high anxiety is significant at 0.01 level. The mean of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions is higher than that of the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. When the teaching effectiveness was compared in the case of Government teacher educators (M=289.55), it was found that the mean teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions with high anxiety having the mean teaching effectiveness (234.62). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with high anxiety have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions with high anxiety. It means that teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions has been affected by their high anxiety. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions with high anxiety” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with high anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions with high anxiety.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with high anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Objective (O3)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety.
Hypothesis (H3)

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety.

Table-3

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>336.11</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>299.88</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that ‘t’ value (5.92 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators and Self-financed teacher educators is significant at 0.01 level. The mean of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators of Government teacher education institutions is higher than the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher educator institutions. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in the case of Government teacher educators (M=336.11), it was found that the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions with low anxiety having mean teaching effectiveness (299.88). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with low anxiety have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions with low anxiety. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions is affected by
their low anxiety. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions with low anxiety” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with low anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions with low anxiety.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with low anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

Objective (O₄)

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety.

Hypothesis (H₄)

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety.

Table-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low anxiety teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>336.11</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High anxiety teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>289.55</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety.
The table reveals that ‘t’ value (25.28 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators having low anxiety is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in case of Government teacher educators (M=336.11) having low anxiety, it was found that the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions with high anxiety having mean teaching effectiveness (289.55). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low anxiety have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high anxiety. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions is affected by their high anxiety. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

**Objective (O₅)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety.
**Hypothesis (H₃)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety.

**Table-5**

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low anxiety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low anxiety teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>299.88</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High anxiety teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>234.62</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that ‘t’ value (9.83 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in case of Self-financed teacher educators (M=299.88) having low anxiety, it was found that the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean teaching effectiveness (234.62). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high anxiety. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions is affected by their high anxiety. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher...
education institutions having high and low anxiety” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low anxiety are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high anxiety.

**Objective (O₆)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress.

**Hypothesis (H₆)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress.

**Table-6**

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>285.29</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that ‘t’ value (21.34 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators having high stress is significant.
at 0.01 level. When the teaching effectiveness was compared in case of Government teacher educators (M=285.29), it was found that the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean teaching effectiveness (235.00). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high stress have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress. It means that the effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions has been affected by their high stress. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high stress are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher educators institutions having high stress.

On the basis of above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress.

**Objective (O_7)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress.

**Hypothesis (H_7)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress.
Table-7

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>337.03</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>318.29</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that ‘t’ value (3.25 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators having low stress is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in case of Government teacher educators (M=337.03), it was found that the mean teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean effectiveness (318.29). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low stress have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions is affected by their low stress. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low stress are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress.
On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress.

**Objective \((O_8)\)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low stress.

**Hypothesis \((H_8)\)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low stress.

| **Table-8** |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| **Groups**       | **Number**      | **Mean**        | **S.D.**          | **‘t’ Value**   |
| Low stress teacher educators | 27               | 337.03          | 5.46              | 38.51           |
| High stress teacher educators | 27               | 285.29          | 4.41              | .01             |

The above table reveals that ‘t’ value (38.51 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low stress is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in the case of the Government teacher educators \((M=337.03)\) having low stress, it was found that the mean teaching effectiveness is
higher than that of the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having mean teaching effectiveness (285.29). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low stress have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high stress. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions is affected by their high stress. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low stress” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low stress are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high stress.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low stress are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high stress.

**Objective (O₉)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low stress.

**Hypothesis (H₀)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low stress.
### Table-9

**Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low stress.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low stress teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>318.29</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High stress teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table reveals that ‘t’ value (14.13 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in case of Self-financed teacher educators (M=318.29) having low stress, it was found that the mean teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean teaching effectiveness (235.00). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions is affected by their high stress. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low stress” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low
stress are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low stress are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high stress.

**Objective (O₁₀)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high Job-satisfaction.

**Hypothesis (H₁₀)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job-satisfaction.

**Table-10**

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job-satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>334.88</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>288.81</td>
<td>58.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals that ‘t’ value (4.04 for df 1/54) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness scores of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions is significant at 0.01 level. When the results were compared in
context of mean teaching effectiveness, it was found that mean teaching effectiveness in
the case of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions
(M=334.88) having high job satisfaction is higher than that of teacher educators working
in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean teaching effectiveness
(288.81). It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in
Government teacher education institutions is higher than that of the teacher educators
working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. It is clear that teacher educators
working in Government teacher education institutions are more satisfied with their job
resulting in better teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in
Self-financed teacher education institutions. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no
significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in
Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job-
satisfaction” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government
teacher education institutions are more satisfied with their job as compared to the teacher
educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators
working in Government teacher education institutions having high job-satisfaction are
more satisfied with their job resulting in better teaching effectiveness as compared to the
teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Objective (O11)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in
Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job
satisfaction.

**Hypothesis (H11)**

There is no significant difference between teaching effectiveness of teacher
educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions
having low job-satisfaction.
Table-11
Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>287.42</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financed teacher educators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>242.55</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that ‘t’ value (17.23 for df 1/54) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education is significant at 0.01 level. When the results were compared in context of mean teaching effectiveness, it was found that the teaching effectiveness in the case of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions (M=287.42) having low job satisfaction is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having mean effectiveness (242.55). It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. It is clear that teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction are more satisfied with their job resulting in better teaching effectiveness as compared to the teachers working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government and Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job-satisfaction” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions are more satisfied with their job as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.
educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions are more satisfied with their job resulting in better teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Objective (O₁₂)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis (H₁₂)**

There is no significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government institutions having high and low job satisfaction.

**Table-12**

Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High job-satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>334.88</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low job-satisfaction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>287.42</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that ‘t’ value (28.14 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of Government teacher educators having low job satisfaction
is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in the case of Government teacher educators (M=334.88), it was found that the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction with mean teaching effectiveness (287.42). It is clear that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high job satisfaction have more teaching effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions is affected by their low job satisfaction. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high and low job-satisfaction” stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high job satisfaction are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having high job satisfaction are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction.

**Objective (O₁₃)**

To compare the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis (H₁₃)**

There is no significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low job satisfaction.
Table-13
Means, SDs and ‘t’ value of teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High job-satisfaction teachers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>288.81</td>
<td>58.03</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low job-satisfaction teachers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>242.55</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that ‘t’ value (3.06 for df 1/52) for difference in the mean teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job-satisfaction is significant at 0.01 level. When the mean teaching effectiveness was compared in case of Self-financed teacher education institutions (M=288.81), the teaching effectiveness is higher than that of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having job satisfaction with mean effectiveness 242.55. It is clear that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job satisfaction have more effectiveness as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction. It means that the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions has been affected by their low job satisfaction. Thus, the null hypothesis, “There is no significance difference between the teaching effectiveness of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high and low job satisfaction”
stands rejected. It means that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job satisfaction are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having high job satisfaction are more effective in teaching as compared to the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions having low job satisfaction.

**Objective (O_{14})**

To find the relationship between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

**Hypothesis (H_{14})**

There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

**Table-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>314.09</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the value of co-efficient of correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety is -.70. It represents a strong degree of negative relationship between two variables which is an indicative of negative correlation between
the above two variables. Hence, there is strong negative correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Government aided teacher education institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions” stands rejected. Thus, we can interpret that there is strong negative correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of the teacher educators of Government teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation it is concluded that teaching effectiveness and anxiety are correlated with each other. Change in the level of anxiety is indirectly proportional to teaching effectiveness.

**Objective (O₁₅)**

To find the relationship between the teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Hypothesis (O₁₅)**

There is no significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Table-15**

Means and ‘r’ ratio of teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>271.50</td>
<td>-.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the value of co-efficient of correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety is -.626. It represents a strong degree of negative
relationship between two variables which is an indicative of negative correlation between the above two variables. Hence, there is strong negative correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions” stands rejected. Thus, we can interpret that there is a strong negative correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of the teacher educators of Self-financed teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teaching effectiveness and anxiety are correlated with each other. Change in the level of anxiety is indirectly proportional to teaching effectiveness.

**Objective (O\(_{16}\))**

To find the relationship between the teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

**Hypothesis (H\(_{16}\))**

There is no significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.
Table-16

Means and ‘r’ ratio of teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher effectiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>314.09</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the value of co-efficient of correlation between teaching effectiveness and stress is -.68. It represents a strong degree of negative relationship between two variables which is an indicative of negative correlation between the above two variables. Hence, there is strong negative correlation between teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions” stands rejected. Thus, we can interpret that there is strong negative correlation between the teaching effectiveness and stress of the teacher educators of Government teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teaching effectiveness and stress are correlated with each other. Change in the level of stress is indirectly proportional to teaching effectiveness.
Objective ($O_{17}$)

To find the relationship between the teaching effectiveness scores and stress of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

Hypothesis ($H_{17}$)

There is no significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in self-financed teacher education institutions.

Table-17

Means and ‘r’ ratio of teaching effectiveness and stress of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>271.50</td>
<td>-.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the value of co-efficient of correlation between teaching effectiveness and stress is -.58. It represents a strong degree of negative relationship between two variables which is an indicative of negative correlation between the above two variables. Hence, there is strong negative correlation between teaching effectiveness and anxiety of teacher educations working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness scores and stress of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions” stands rejected. Thus, we can interpret that there is a strong negative correlation between the teaching effectiveness and stress of the teacher educators of self-financed teacher education institutions.
On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teaching effectiveness and stress are correlated with each other. Change in the level of stress is indirectly proportional to teaching effectiveness.

Objective (O₁₈)

To find the relationship between the teaching effectiveness and Job-satisfaction of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

Hypothesis (H₁₈)

There is no significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and Job-satisfaction of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

Table-18

Means and ‘r’ ratio of teaching effectiveness and Job-satisfaction of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>314.09</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Satisfaction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the value of co-efficient of correlation between teaching effectiveness and job satisfaction is .694. It represents a positive relationship between two variables which is an indicative of positive correlation between the above two variables. Hence, there is a positive correlation between teaching effectiveness and job satisfaction of teacher educators working in Government teacher education.
institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness and job satisfaction of teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions” stands rejected. Thus, we can interpret that there is a positive correlation between the effectiveness and job satisfaction of the teacher educators working in Government teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teaching effectiveness and job-satisfaction are correlated with each other. Change in the level of job-satisfaction is directly proportional to teaching effectiveness.

**Objective (O₁₉)**

To compare the relationship between the teaching effectiveness and Job-satisfaction of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Hypothesis H₁₉**

There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness scores and Job-satisfaction of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

**Table-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>271.50</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-satisfaction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table=19 on pre-page shows that the value of co-efficient of correlation between teaching effectiveness and job satisfaction is .423. It represents a positive relationship between two variables which is an indicative of positive correlation between the above two variables. Hence, there is a positive correlation between teaching effectiveness and job satisfaction of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant relationship between the teaching effectiveness and job satisfaction of teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions” stands rejected. Thus, we can interpret that there is a positive correlation between the effectiveness and job satisfaction of the teacher educators working in Self-financed teacher education institutions.

On the basis of the above interpretation, it is concluded that teaching effectiveness and job-satisfaction are correlated with each other. Change in the level of job-satisfaction is directly proportional to teaching effectiveness.