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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.0 Introduction

However valid, reliable and adequate the data may be, it does not serve any useful purpose unless it is carefully processed, systematically classified and tabulated, scientifically analyzed, intelligently interpreted and rationally concluded.

After the data had been collected, it was processed and analyzed using Microsoft Excel-97 and SPSS Software to draw exact conclusions.

The data collected from the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools were analyzed with reference to the objectives and hypothesis set for the study. Analysis was primarily taken up with regard to teachers’ and head teachers’ attitude with regard to infrastructure facilities, classroom climate, intelligent quotient and academic achievements of IV standard students. The data have been subjected to statistical treatment in terms of descriptive, differential, correlation, multiple regression and path analysis. The results of statistical analysis have been summarized, tabulated and interpreted appropriately in the following section.
The following Statistical Techniques are used for the study.

1. Descriptive Statistics.
2. Differential Statistics like 't' test, ANOVA and 'F' test were formulated corresponding to null hypothesis.
3. Analysis of Co-variance
4. Co relational analysis
5. Regression analysis
6. Path analysis

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

To begin with most elementary and essential statistical methods like calculation of Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in descriptive statistics is carried out and represented in table-1

The mean and standard deviations for teachers' attitude, classroom climate, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient, and academic achievement of the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with various characteristics are presented.

Table-1: Mean and SD of DPEP school teachers' attitude score and its dimensions by location (urban and rural).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>21.8100</td>
<td>17.3000</td>
<td>19.5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.8915</td>
<td>0.9583</td>
<td>2.4463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7908</td>
<td>1.7416</td>
<td>1.7576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.7600</td>
<td>20.6800</td>
<td>20.7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.4973</td>
<td>0.8792</td>
<td>0.7118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.4100</td>
<td>22.3400</td>
<td>22.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.1767</td>
<td>1.1625</td>
<td>1.1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>86.3700</td>
<td>81.6700</td>
<td>84.0200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.7550</td>
<td>2.2556</td>
<td>3.4428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table it is quite clear that, the Mean of urban area is 21.81 and SD 0.89 and that of rural area is 17.30 and SD 0.95 for physical facilities. (One of the dimensions of teachers’ attitude) Similarly for teaching learning process the mean for urban area is 21.39 SD 1.79 whereas rural areas have mean of 21.39 and SD of 1.74. Likewise for teacher student relationship mean of urban area is 20.76; SD 0.49 and rural is 20.68, SD 0.87. For one more dimensions of teachers' attitude is school educational social and cultural environment the mean of urban area is 22.41 , SD 1.17 and of rural area is 22.34 , SD 1.16, when the total attitude is concerned the mean of urban area is 86.37 , SD 2.75 and of rural area is mean of 81.67 , SD 2.25. This clearly shows that, in every case the mean and SD of urban area is higher than the mean and SD of rural area of DPEP schools. It means the attitude of the teachers working in urban DPEP schools is better than their counter parts in rural DPEP schools.

**Table-2: Mean and SD of Non-DPEP school teachers’ attitude score And its dimensions by location (urban and rural).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>16.7000</td>
<td>10.4100</td>
<td>13.5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.7143</td>
<td>0.8788</td>
<td>3.2597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Learning process</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>13.6600</td>
<td>10.6400</td>
<td>12.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.1843</td>
<td>0.7762</td>
<td>1.8153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Student relationship</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>12.8600</td>
<td>8.9700</td>
<td>10.9150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.1475</td>
<td>0.4888</td>
<td>2.1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>14.2600</td>
<td>11.2100</td>
<td>12.7350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.3410</td>
<td>1.1116</td>
<td>1.9623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>57.4800</td>
<td>41.2300</td>
<td>49.3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>3.0422</td>
<td>1.9384</td>
<td>8.5512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table it is quite clear that, the Mean of urban area is 16.70 and SD is 0.71 to that of rural area is 10.41 and SD 0.87 for physical facilities. Similarly for teaching learning process the mean of urban area is 13.66 and SD 1.18, whereas rural is 10.64 and 0.77. Likewise for teaching learning process mean of urban is 12.86 and SD 1.14 and rural is 8.99 and 0.48. In the same way school educational social and cultural environment the mean is 14.26 and SD is 1.34 and rural is 11.21 and 1.11. The total attitude of school teachers’ and its dimensions by location is considered for urban is 57.48 and SD is 3.04 and rural is 41.23 and SD is 1.93. This clearly shows that the mean of urban area is higher than the mean of rural area of Non-DPEP schools.

Table-3: Mean and SD of classroom climate scores of DPEP schools and its dimensions by location (urban and rural).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>21.6100</td>
<td>17.3250</td>
<td>19.4675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.3676</td>
<td>0.8954</td>
<td>2.4411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7614</td>
<td>1.7426</td>
<td>1.7445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.9000</td>
<td>20.6150</td>
<td>20.7575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.6851</td>
<td>0.8853</td>
<td>0.8005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.3700</td>
<td>22.1825</td>
<td>22.2763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.2114</td>
<td>1.2130</td>
<td>1.2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>86.2400</td>
<td>81.3450</td>
<td>83.7925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.9524</td>
<td>2.4280</td>
<td>3.6446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that, the mean of urban area is 21.61 and SD is 1.36 to that of rural area is 17.32 and 0.89 for physical environment. Similarly for academic environment the mean of urban is 21.36 and SD is 1.76, where as rural is 21.22 and 1.74. Likewise for
democratic approach in class the mean of urban is 20.90 and SD is 0.68 of rural is 20.61 and 0.88. In the same way the disorganization in class the mean of urban is 22.37 and SD is 1.21 and rural is 22.18 and 1.21. If we consider the total class room climate scores of DPEP schools and its dimensions by locations (Urban and Rural) mean for urban area is 86.24 and SD is 2.95 and rural 81.34 and SD is 2.42. It clearly shows that, in every case the mean and SD of urban area is higher than the rural area of DPEP schools.

Table-4: Mean and SD of classroom climate scores of non-DPEP schools and its dimensions by location (urban and rural)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.7973</td>
<td>0.9008</td>
<td>3.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>13.7200</td>
<td>10.7325</td>
<td>12.2263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.2254</td>
<td>0.7767</td>
<td>1.8154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Approach in</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>12.9000</td>
<td>9.3675</td>
<td>11.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.1429</td>
<td>0.7356</td>
<td>2.0163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>14.2900</td>
<td>11.3075</td>
<td>12.7988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.3213</td>
<td>1.1554</td>
<td>1.9419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>57.3000</td>
<td>41.9150</td>
<td>49.6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>3.0203</td>
<td>2.0276</td>
<td>8.1438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates mean and SD of class room climate scores of Non-DPEP schools and its dimensions by location (Urban and Rural). The mean of urban area is 16.39 and SD is 0.79 to that of rural area is 10.50 and 0.90 for the sub dimension physical environment. In
the same way when we consider academic environment, the mean of urban 13.72 and SD is 1.22, where as rural is 10.73 and 0.77 for democratic approach in class the mean of urban area is 12.90 and SD is 1.14 and rural is 9.36 and 0.73. The other dimension of class room climate is disorganization in class the Mean of urban area is 14.29 and SD is 1.32 and of rural area is 11.30 and 1.15. On the whole the mean and SD of class room climate of urban area is 57.30 and SD is 3.02 to that of rural area 41.91 and 2.02. This clearly shows that, the Mean and SD of urban area is higher than the Mean and SD of rural area of Non-DPEP schools.

Table-5: Mean and SD of Infrastructure, Intelligent and academic achievement scores of DPEP and non-DPEP schools by location (urban and rural).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>DPEP Schools</th>
<th>Non-DPEP schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>36.9400</td>
<td>35.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.5832</td>
<td>2.6049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>89.9800</td>
<td>90.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>5.2469</td>
<td>5.3232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>87.4400</td>
<td>66.3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>5.0595</td>
<td>2.3102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that, mean and SD of infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement scores of DPEP schools by location (urban and rural). One of the independent variables i.e., infrastructure facilities, the mean of urban area is 36.94 and SD is 1.58 to that of rural area is 35.30 and 2.60. Similarly, for intelligent
quotient mean of urban area is 89.98 SD is 5.24 to that of rural is 90.30 and 5.32. Coming to the dependent variable i.e., academic achievement is concerned the mean of 87.44 and SD is 5.05 to that of 66.36 and 2.31.

On the contrary, the above table indicates the mean and SD of infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement of Non-DPEP schools by location of urban and rural. Infrastructure facilities variable is concerned the mean of urban area is 21.32 and SD is 5.16 to that of 15.86 and 2.37. Mean of urban area is 89.98 and SD is 5.24 to that of rural area is 90.30 and SD is 5.32 for intelligent quotient. Coming to the academic achievement of the children is concerned the mean of urban area 65.12 and SD is 5.48 to that of rural area is 43.26 and SD 8.77.

It clearly shows that, the mean and SD of infrastructure facilities of urban and rural areas of DPEP schools is higher than the mean and SD of the Non-DPEP schools, where as the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools and Non-DPP schools remains the same. The academic achievement scores of DPEP schools is better than achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools in respect of both urban and rural area.
Table-6: Mean and SD of DPEP school teacher's attitude score and its dimensions by SES (High, Medium, Low).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.3879</td>
<td>2.4017</td>
<td>2.4611</td>
<td>2.4463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7613</td>
<td>1.6655</td>
<td>1.9035</td>
<td>1.7576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Student relationship</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.8514</td>
<td>20.6341</td>
<td>20.6591</td>
<td>20.7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.6547</td>
<td>0.7161</td>
<td>0.7926</td>
<td>0.7118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.1622</td>
<td>22.5366</td>
<td>22.4318</td>
<td>22.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.2194</td>
<td>1.1423</td>
<td>1.1051</td>
<td>1.1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>84.9189</td>
<td>83.5976</td>
<td>83.2955</td>
<td>84.0200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>3.7722</td>
<td>3.1607</td>
<td>3.1835</td>
<td>3.4428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the mean and SD of DPEP school teachers' attitude score and its dimensions by SES (high medium and low). It is clear from above table that, the mean of high SES is 20.21 and SD is 2.38. The mean of medium SES is 19.34 and SD is 2.40 and mean of low SES is 18.84 and SD is 2.46 for physical facilities. Similarly for teaching learning process the mean of high SES is 21.68 SD is 1.76 the mean of medium SES is 21.08 and SD is 1.66. The mean of low SES is 21.36 and SD is 1.90. Coming to the one more dimensions teacher student relationship is concerned the mean of high SES is 20.85 SD is 0.65, the mean of medium SES is 20.63 and SD is 0.71, the mean of low SES is 20.65 and SD is 0.79. Lastly for SES &CE variable, the mean of high SES is 22.16, SD is 1.21, The mean of medium SES is 22.53, SD is 1.14, the mean of low SES is 22.43 SD 1.10. On the whole when we consider the total attitude score of DPEP school teachers is concerned the mean of
high SES is 84.91, SD is 3.77, the mean of medium SES is 83.59, SD 3.16, the mean of low SES is 83.29 and SD 3.18. The teachers’ attitude working in DPEP schools that are belonging to various socio economic status groups, there is slight difference among the various groups.

Table-7: Mean and SD of Non-DPEP schoolteacher’s attitude score and its dimensions by SES (High, Medium, Low).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>15.9286</td>
<td>13.8300</td>
<td>11.3621</td>
<td>13.5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.4814</td>
<td>3.3145</td>
<td>2.1460</td>
<td>3.2597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Learning process</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>13.2381</td>
<td>12.3500</td>
<td>11.0172</td>
<td>12.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.6630</td>
<td>1.8246</td>
<td>1.2499</td>
<td>1.8153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Student relationship</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>12.4286</td>
<td>10.9600</td>
<td>9.7414</td>
<td>10.9150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7978</td>
<td>2.2012</td>
<td>1.5155</td>
<td>2.1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>13.8810</td>
<td>12.7600</td>
<td>11.8621</td>
<td>12.7350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.5158</td>
<td>1.9516</td>
<td>1.8799</td>
<td>1.9623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>55.4762</td>
<td>49.9000</td>
<td>43.9828</td>
<td>49.3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>6.4759</td>
<td>8.6949</td>
<td>6.1448</td>
<td>8.5512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows mean and SD of Non-DPEP school teachers’ attitude score and its dimensions by SES (high medium low). It is clear from the above table that, the mean of high SES is 15.92 and SD is 2.48, the mean of medium SES is 13.23 and SD is 3.31. The mean of SES is 11.36 and SD 2.14 for physical facilities. Similarly for teaching learning process the mean of high SES is 13.23 SD 1.66, the mean of low SES is 11.01 and SD is 1.24. Coming to the one more dimension i.e., teacher student relationship is concerned the mean of high SES is 12.42 , SD is 1.79, the mean of medium SES is 10.96 SF 2.20, the mean of low SES is 9.74 SD 1.51. Lastly for SES & CE variable the mean of high SES is
13.88, SD 1.51, the mean of medium SES is 12.76, SD 1.95, the mean of low SES 11.86, SD 1.87.

On the whole, when we consider the total attitude score of Non-DPEP school teachers is concerned, the mean of high SES 55.47, SD 6.47, the mean of medium SES is 49.90, SD 8.69, the mean of low SES is 43.98 and SD 6.14. The teachers' attitude working in Non-DPEP schools who are belonging to different SES groups, there is slight difference among them.

Table-8: Mean and SD of classroom climate scores of DPEP schools and its dimensions by SES (High, Medium, Low).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.1216</td>
<td>19.1707</td>
<td>18.9205</td>
<td>19.4675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.5039</td>
<td>2.3200</td>
<td>2.4194</td>
<td>2.4411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7145</td>
<td>1.7589</td>
<td>1.7467</td>
<td>1.7445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>21.0135</td>
<td>20.6098</td>
<td>20.6023</td>
<td>20.7575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.7020</td>
<td>0.8330</td>
<td>0.8189</td>
<td>0.8005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.0541</td>
<td>22.4024</td>
<td>22.4148</td>
<td>22.2763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.2404</td>
<td>1.2001</td>
<td>1.1748</td>
<td>1.2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>84.8243</td>
<td>83.1951</td>
<td>83.1705</td>
<td>83.7925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>3.8626</td>
<td>3.3126</td>
<td>3.6281</td>
<td>3.6446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the mean and SD of class room climate scores DPEP schools and its dimensions by SES (high, medium and low). One of the dimensions of class room climate that is physical environment, the mean of high SES is 20.12, SD 2.50, mean of medium SES is 19.17, SD 2.32, the mean of low SES is 18.92, SD, 2.41. Similarly, mean of high SES is 21.63, SD 1.17, mean of medium SES is 21.01, SD 1.75, and the mean of low SES is 21.23 SD 1.74 in respect of
academic environment of class room climate. On the other hand the variable democratic approach, the mean of high SES is 21.01, SD 0.70, the mean of medium SES is 20.60, and SD 0.83, the mean of low SES is 20.60, SD 0.81. In the same way disorganization in the class, the mean of high SES is 22.05, SD 1.24, the mean of medium SES is 22.40, SD 1.20, the mean of low SES is 22.41, SD 1.17. For total class room climate, the mean of high SES is 84.82, SD 3.86, the mean of medium SES is 83.19, SD 3.31 and the mean of low SES is 83.17, SD 3.16. This means that, the teachers belonging to different SES groups of DPEP schools have different types of class room climate.

Table-9: Mean and SD of classroom climate scores of non-DPEP schools and its dimensions by SES (High, Medium, Low).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.3591</td>
<td>3.1546</td>
<td>1.9916</td>
<td>3.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>13.2619</td>
<td>12.4200</td>
<td>11.1422</td>
<td>12.2263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.6479</td>
<td>1.8221</td>
<td>1.3470</td>
<td>1.8154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>12.5000</td>
<td>11.1700</td>
<td>10.0819</td>
<td>11.1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.8371</td>
<td>2.0143</td>
<td>1.5215</td>
<td>2.0163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>13.8810</td>
<td>12.8700</td>
<td>11.8922</td>
<td>12.7988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.5158</td>
<td>1.9241</td>
<td>1.8642</td>
<td>1.9419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>55.2381</td>
<td>50.2100</td>
<td>44.4914</td>
<td>49.6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>6.2542</td>
<td>8.2852</td>
<td>5.9072</td>
<td>8.1438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above tale indicates, Mean and SD of class room climate scores Non-DPEP schools and its dimensions by SES (high, medium and low). One of the dimensions of class room climate that is physical environment, the mean of high SES is 15.59, SD 2.35, mean of medium SES is 13.75, SD 3.15, the mean of low SES is 11.37, SD 1.99.
Similarly, mean of high SES is 13.26, SD 1.64, mean of medium SES is 12.42, SD 1.82, and the Mean of low SES is 11.14 SD 1.34 in respect of academic environment of class room climate. On the other hand the variable democratic approach, the Mean of high SES is 12.50, SD 1.83, the mean of medium SES is 11.17, SD 2.01, and the Mean of low SES is 10.08, SD 1.52. In the same way disorganization in the class, the mean of high SES is 13.88, SD 1.51, the Mean of medium SES is 12.87, SD 1.92, the mean of low SES is 11.89, SD 1.86. For total class room climate, the Mean of high SES is 55.23, SD 6.25, the Mean of medium SES is 50.21, SD 8.28 and the mean of low SES is 44.49, SD 5.90. This means that, the teachers belonging to different SES groups of Non-DPEP schools have different types of class room climate.

It is quite clear that, the mean and SD of class room climate scores of DPEP schools and its dimensions by SES is higher than the Non-DPEP schools.
Table-10: Mean and SD of Infrastructure, IQ and Academic Achievement scores of DPEP and non-DPEP schools by SES (High, Medium, Low).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>DPEP Schools</th>
<th>Non-DPEP schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>36.5946</td>
<td>35.6829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.3858</td>
<td>2.3285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>89.3784</td>
<td>89.7073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>4.8668</td>
<td>5.7326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>79.0000</td>
<td>76.0488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates Mean and SD of infrastructure, IQ and academic achievement scores DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by SES (High, Medium and Low). One variable that is infrastructure facilities, the mean of high SES is 36.59, SD 2.38, the mean of medium SES is 35.68, SD 2.38, and the Mean of low SES is 36.13 and SD 2.00. Similarly, mean of high SES is 89.37, SD 4.86, mean of medium SES is 89.70, SD 5.73, and the Mean of low SES is 92.22, SD 4.61 in respect of IQ. On the other hand academic achievement variable mean of high SES is 79.00 SD 10.91, the Mean of medium SES is 76.04, SD 10.50, and the Mean of low SES is 74.95, SD 13.18.

In the same way, the table also shows the mean and SD of infrastructure facilities, IQ and academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools by SES (high, medium and low).

One variable that is infrastructure facilities, the mean of high SES is 22.19, SD 5.38, the mean of medium SES is 18.74, SD 4.79, and the
Mean of low SES is 15.72 and SD 1.99. Similarly, mean of high SES is 90.19, SD 5.78, mean of medium SES is 89.90, SD 5.05, and the Mean of low SES is 90.51, SD 5.38 in respect of IQ. On the other hand academic achievement variable mean of high SES is 61.38 SD 10.72, the Mean of medium SES is 56.04, SD 12.66, and the Mean of low SES is 45.79, SD 11.54.

It is quite evident that, the mean and SD of infrastructure facilities, and academic achievement scores of DPEP schools is better than the Non-DPEP schools. Where as the IQ remains the same.

Table-11: Mean and SD of school teacher's attitude score and its dimensions by DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>DPEP</th>
<th>Non-DPEP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.4463</td>
<td>3.2597</td>
<td>4.1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Learning process</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>21.3700</td>
<td>12.1500</td>
<td>16.7600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7576</td>
<td>1.8153</td>
<td>4.9533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Student relationship</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.7200</td>
<td>10.9150</td>
<td>15.8175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.7118</td>
<td>2.1427</td>
<td>5.1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.3750</td>
<td>12.7350</td>
<td>17.5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.1642</td>
<td>1.9623</td>
<td>5.0931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>84.0200</td>
<td>49.3550</td>
<td>66.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>3.4428</td>
<td>8.5512</td>
<td>18.5526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the mean and SD of school teachers' attitude scores and its dimensions by DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. One dimension that is physical facilities, the mean of DPEP is 19.55, SD 2.44 and mean of Non-DPEP is 13.55, SD 2.25. Similarly, the mean of DPEP
is 21.37, SD 1.75 and mean of Non-DPEP is 12.15, SD 1.81 in respect of teaching learning process. In the same way teacher student relationship, the mean of DPEP is 20.72, SD 0.71 the mean of Non-DPEP is 10.91, SD 2.14. Similarly, mean of DPEP is 22.37, SD 1.16 and mean of Non-DPEP is 12.73, SD 1.196 in respect of school educational social and cultural environment. When we consider the total attitude, the mean of DPEP is 84.02, SD 3.44; the Mean of Non-DPEP is 49.35, SD 8.55.

It clearly indicates that, the attitude of teachers of DPEP schools is better than the Non-DPEP schools.

Table-12: Mean and SD of classroom climate scores and its dimensions by DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>DPEP</th>
<th>Non-DPEP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.4411</td>
<td>3.0748</td>
<td>4.0951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.7445</td>
<td>1.8154</td>
<td>4.8786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>20.7575</td>
<td>11.1338</td>
<td>15.9456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>0.8005</td>
<td>2.0163</td>
<td>5.0608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>22.2763</td>
<td>12.7988</td>
<td>17.5375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>1.2097</td>
<td>1.9419</td>
<td>5.0172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>83.7925</td>
<td>49.6075</td>
<td>66.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>3.6446</td>
<td>8.1439</td>
<td>18.2544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that, the Mean and SD of class room climate and its dimensions by DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. One dimension that is physical environment the mean of DPEP is 19.46, SD 2.44, the mean of Non-DPEP is 13.44, SD 3.07. Similarly, mean of DPEP is 21.29, SD 1.74; the mean of Non-DPEP is 12.22, SD 1.81 in respect of academic environment. In the same way democratic approach in class,
onward the mean of DPEP is 20.75, SD 0.80 the mean of Non-DPEP is 11.13 SD 2.01. Lastly of disorganization in class the mean of DPEP is 22.27, SD 1.20, the mean of Non-DPEP is 12.79 SD 1.94.

In respect of total class room climate score the mean of DPEP is 83.79 SD 3.64, the mean of Non-DPEP is 49.60 SD 8.14.

It is clearly evident that, the class room climate of DPEP schools is better than Non-DPEP schools.

**Table-13: Mean and SD of Infrastructure, IQ and academic achievement scores by DPEP and non-DPEP schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>DPEP</td>
<td>36.1200</td>
<td>18.5900</td>
<td>27.3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>2.2975</td>
<td>4.8494</td>
<td>9.5675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>DPEP</td>
<td>90.1400</td>
<td>90.1400</td>
<td>90.1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotient</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>5.2609</td>
<td>5.2609</td>
<td>5.2477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>DPEP</td>
<td>76.9000</td>
<td>54.1900</td>
<td>65.5450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>11.2927</td>
<td>13.1776</td>
<td>16.7157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-DPEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Grps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-13 clearly shows that the Mean and SD of infrastructure, IQ and academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. Infrastructure facilities. One independent variable, the mean of DPEP is 36.12 SD 2.29; the mean of Non-DPEP is 18.58 SD. 4.84. Similarly, the mean of DPEP is 90.14 and SD 5.26, the mean and SD of Non-DPEP schools is the same in respect of IQ. Lastly, in respect of academic achievement, the mean of DPEP is 76.90, SD 11.29; the mean of Non-DPEP is 54.19, SD 13.17.
From the above table it is clear that, the infrastructure facilities of DPEP schools are better than Non-DPEP schools. Where as the IQ of both the schools remain the same. The academic achievement of the children is concerned, the students belonging to DPEP schools are better than the Non-DPEP schools.
4.2 Differential statistics

The differences between the mean of teachers’ attitude, class room climate, infrastructure facilities, students intelligence and their academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools in the selected characteristic or independent factors are studied by using students T-test, ANCOVA test or 'F'-test, Scheffe’s multiple comparison t tests were applied and the results were discussed in the preceding section.

**Major Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teacher’s total attitude and its dimensions scores.

**Table 14:** Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers attitude score and its dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=100)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=100)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>84.0200</td>
<td>49.3550</td>
<td>37.6048</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>19.5550</td>
<td>13.5550</td>
<td>14.7220</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>21.3700</td>
<td>12.1500</td>
<td>36.4896</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>20.7200</td>
<td>10.9150</td>
<td>43.4264</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>22.3750</td>
<td>12.7350</td>
<td>42.2490</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: shows the results of students't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers attitude scores on the other dimensions like
physical facilities, teaching learning process, teacher students relationship and school educational, social and cultural environment.

Looking into the table the 't' value of 37.60 at 0.01 level is significant which shows that there is significant difference between teachers attitude belongs to DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. This is also clear that the teachers belonging to DPEP schools have more positive attitude than the teachers working in Non-DPEP schools. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated in this regard is rejected and the alternative one is accepted.

The other dimensions like physical facilities of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 14.72 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. The alternate assumption is accepted, which means that the physical facilities provided in the DPEP schools are significantly better than the facilities provided in Non-DPEP schools. Similarly the teaching learning process of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared the 't' value is 36.48 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formed is rejected and alternate one is accepted, which means the teaching learning process in DPEP schools is significantly better than Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly the teacher student relationship of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared, where the 't' value is 43.42 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the
alternate one is accepted. It means that the teacher student relationship is significantly better in DPEP schools than in the Non-DPEP schools. Similarly the school educational, social and cultural environment of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools was compared where the 't' value is 42.24 at 0.01 level of significance, is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis formulated in this regard is rejected. The alternate assumption is accepted which clearly shows that the school educational, social and cultural environment of DPEP schools is significantly better than Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schoolteachers of urban area with respect to their teacher's total attitude and its dimensions score.

**Table -15: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers of urban area by attitude score and its dimensions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Attitude</strong></td>
<td>Mean 86.3700</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 2.7550</td>
<td>Mean 57.4800</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 3.0422</td>
<td>49.7740 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>Mean 21.8100</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 0.8915</td>
<td>Mean 16.7000</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 0.7143</td>
<td>31.6301 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>Mean 21.3900</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 1.7908</td>
<td>Mean 13.6600</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 1.1843</td>
<td>25.4588 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>Mean 20.7600</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 0.4973</td>
<td>Mean 12.8600</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 1.1475</td>
<td>44.6665 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>Mean 22.4100</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 1.1767</td>
<td>Mean 14.2600</td>
<td>Std.Dev. 1.3410</td>
<td>32.3018 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows the results of student 't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers of urban area with respect to their teachers' total attitude and its dimensions like physical facilities, teaching learning process, teacher student relationship, school educational and cultural environment.

By looking into the table the 't' value of 49.77 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant, which shows that, there is significant difference between the teachers' attitude of urban area belonging to DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. This also clearly shows that, the attitude of teachers of urban area belonging to DPEP schools have more positive attitude than the urban teachers working in Non-DPEP schools. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated is rejected and the alternate one is accepted.

The other dimensions like physical facilities of urban area of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 31.63 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected, the alternate assumption accepted, which means that, the physical facilities provided in the urban schools of DPEP are significantly better than the physical facilities provided in the urban Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly teaching learning process of both urban area of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared, the 't' value of 25.45 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formed is rejected and the alternate one is accepted, which means that the teaching
learning process in DPEP urban schools is significantly better than Non-DPEP urban schools.

Similarly teachers' student relationship of both DPEP urban and Non-DPEP urban schools are compared. The 't' value of 44.66 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate is accepted. It means that, the student teacher relationship is significantly better in DPEP urban schools than in the Non-DPEP urban schools.

On the same lines school educational, social and cultural environment of both the DPEP urban and Non-DPEP urban schools was compared where the 't' value of 32.30 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis in this regard is rejected. The other one is accepted as it clearly shows that, school educational, social and cultural environment of DPEP urban schools is significantly better than the Non-DPEP urban schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schoolteachers of rural area with respect to their teacher's total attitude and its dimensions scores.
Table-16: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers of rural area by attitude score and its dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>81.6700 2.2556</td>
<td>41.5098 2.7704</td>
<td>79.8002</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>17.3000 0.9583</td>
<td>10.5490 1.3201</td>
<td>29.3628</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>21.3500 1.7416</td>
<td>10.6667 0.7916</td>
<td>39.8151</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>20.6800 0.8792</td>
<td>9.0490 0.7433</td>
<td>71.8452</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>22.3400 1.1625</td>
<td>11.2451 1.1286</td>
<td>48.6671</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that, the results of student 't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers' attitude of rural area in respect of their attitude score and its dimensions like physical facilities, teaching learning process, teachers student relationship, school educational social and cultural environment.

By observing the above table the 't' value 79.80 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant which shows that, there is significant difference between the teachers attitude belonging to DPEP rural and Non-DPEP rural schools. It also shows that, the teachers belonging to DPEP rural schools have more positive attitude than the teachers working in Non-
DPEP schools. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

In the same way, the other dimension like Physical facilities of DPEP rural schools and Non-DPEP rural schools are compared. The 't' value of 29.36 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the assumption is accepted. It means the physical facilities provided in the DPEP rural schools are significantly better than the physical facilities provided in Non-DPEP rural schools.

On the same lines, teaching learning process of both DPEP rural and Non-DPEP rural schools are compared here. The 't' value of 39.81 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the one is accepted. It means that, the teaching learning process in DPEP rural schools is significantly better than, Non-DPEP rural schools.

In the same way, teacher student relationship of both DPEP rural and Non-DPEP rural schools are compared. The 't' value of 71.84 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means the teacher student relationship is significantly better in DPEP rural schools than in the Non-DPEP rural schools.
Similarly, school educational, social and cultural environment of both the DPEP rural and Non-DPEP rural school is compared. The 't' value of 48.66 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis formulated in this regard is rejected. The alternate assumption is accepted, which clearly shows that, school educational, social and cultural environment of DPEP rural schools is significantly better than Non-DPEP rural schools.

**Major Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teacher's attitude and its dimensions in high socio-economic status group.

**Table-17: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in high socio-economic status group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=37)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=21)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>84.9189</td>
<td>3.7722</td>
<td>55.4762</td>
<td>6.4759</td>
<td>21.9403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>20.2162</td>
<td>2.3879</td>
<td>15.9286</td>
<td>2.4814</td>
<td>6.4804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>21.6892</td>
<td>1.7613</td>
<td>13.2381</td>
<td>1.6630</td>
<td>17.9128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>20.8514</td>
<td>0.6547</td>
<td>12.4286</td>
<td>1.7978</td>
<td>25.7808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>22.1622</td>
<td>1.2194</td>
<td>13.8810</td>
<td>1.5158</td>
<td>22.7414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that, the results of student 't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools teachers attitude and its dimensions in high socio economic status group. Looking into the above table, the 't' value of 21.94 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null
hypothesis formulated is rejected and the other one is accepted. It shows
that, there is significant difference between the attitude of teachers in
high socio economic status of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. It also
indicates that, the teachers in high socio economic status of DPEP
schools have more positive attitude than the teachers in high socio
economic status group of Non-DPEP schools. Coming to the other
dimension of physical facilities of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are
compared, the 't' value of 6.48 at 0.01 level of significance is significant.
Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is
accepted. This mean the physical facilities provided to the teachers
belonging to high socio economic status of DPEP schools are significantly
better than the physical facilities provided to the teachers in high socio
economic status of Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly, the teaching learning process of both DPEP and Non-
DPEP schools with respect to high socio economic status group is
compared. The 't' value of 17.91 at 0.01 level of significance is significant.
Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted.
Which means the teaching learning process with high socio economic
status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the high socio
economic status group of Non-DPEP schools? In the same way teacher
student relationship of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with high
socio economic status group are compared. The 't' value of 25.78 at 0.01
levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted, which clearly indicates that, the teaching learning process with high socio economic status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the high socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly, the school educational, social and cultural environment of both the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools having high socio economic status is compared. The 't' value of 22.74 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated in this regard is rejected. The alternate assumption is accepted which clearly shows that, the school educational social and cultural environment of DPEP schools having high socio economic status is better than that of Non-DPEP schools having high socio economic status.

**Sub Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teacher's total attitude and its dimensions in medium socio-economic status group.
Table-18: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in medium socio-economic status group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=41)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>83.5976</td>
<td>3.1607</td>
<td>49.9000</td>
<td>8.6949</td>
<td>23.5527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>19.3415</td>
<td>2.4017</td>
<td>13.8300</td>
<td>3.3145</td>
<td>8.8991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>21.0854</td>
<td>1.6655</td>
<td>12.3500</td>
<td>1.8246</td>
<td>23.6264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>20.6341</td>
<td>0.7161</td>
<td>10.9600</td>
<td>2.2012</td>
<td>26.9719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>22.5366</td>
<td>1.1423</td>
<td>12.7600</td>
<td>1.9516</td>
<td>28.3275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that, the results of student't’ test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools teachers attitude and its dimensions in medium socio economic status group. Looking into the above table, the't’ value of 23.55 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated is rejected and the other one is accepted. It shows that, there is significant difference between the attitude of teachers in medium socio economic status of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. It also indicates that, the teachers in high socio economic status of DPEP schools have more positive attitude than the teachers in medium socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools. Coming to the other dimension of physical facilities of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared .The ‘t’ value of 8.89 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means that the physical facilities provided to the teachers
belonging to medium socio economic status of DPEP schools are significantly better than the physical facilities provided to the teachers in medium socio economic status of Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly the teaching learning process of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to medium socio economic status group is compared. The 't' value of 23.62 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted which means the teaching learning process with medium socio economic status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the high socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools. In the same way teacher student relationship of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with medium socio economic status group are compared. The 't' value of 26.97 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted which clearly indicates that, the teaching learning process with high socio economic status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the medium socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly, the school educational, social and cultural environment of both the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools having medium socio economic status is compared. The 't' value of 28.32 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated in this regard is rejected.
The alternate assumption is accepted which clearly shows that, the school educational social and cultural environment of DPEP schools having medium socio economic status is better than that of Non-DPEP schools having medium socio economic status.

**Sub hypothesis 4:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teacher's total attitude and its dimensions in low socio-economic status group.

**Table-19: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in low socio-economic status group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=22)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=29)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>83.2955 3.1835</td>
<td>43.9828 6.1448</td>
<td>27.3113</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>18.8409 2.4611</td>
<td>11.3621 2.1460</td>
<td>11.5696</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>21.3636 1.9035</td>
<td>11.0172 1.2499</td>
<td>23.4005</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>20.6591 0.7926</td>
<td>9.7414 1.5155</td>
<td>30.7039</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>22.4318 1.1051</td>
<td>11.8621 1.8799</td>
<td>23.4442</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that, the results of t' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools teachers attitude and its dimensions in low socio-economic status group. Looking into the above table, the t' value of 27.31 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated is rejected and the other one is accepted. It shows that, there is significant difference between the attitude of teachers in low socio-
economic status of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. It also indicates that, the teachers in high socio economic status of DPEP schools have more positive attitude than the teachers in high socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools. Coming to the other dimension of physical facilities of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared, the 't' value of 11.56 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This mean the physical facilities provided to the teachers belonging to low socio economic status of DPEP schools are significantly better than the physical facilities provided to the teachers in low socio economic status of Non-DPEP schools.

Similarly the teaching learning process of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to medium socio economic status group is compared. The 't' value of 23.40 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Which means the teaching learning process with high socio economic status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the low socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools? In the same way teacher students relationship of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with low socio economic status group are compared. The 't' value of 30.70 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted. Which clearly indicates that, the teaching learning process with low socio economic status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the low socio economic status group of Non-DPEP schools?

Similarly, the school educational, social and cultural environment of both the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools having low socio economic
status is compared. The 't' value of 23.44 at 0.01 level of significance is
significant. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated in this regard is
rejected.

The alternate assumption is accepted which clearly shows that, the
school educational social and cultural environment of DPEP schools
having low socio economic status is better than that of Non-DPEP
schools having low socio economic status.

**Major Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant difference between DPEP
and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their total classroom climate and
its dimensions scores.

**Table-20:** Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP
schools by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=100)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=100)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>83.7925</td>
<td>3.6446</td>
<td>49.6075</td>
<td>8.1438</td>
<td>38.3147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>19.4675</td>
<td>13.4488</td>
<td>3.0748</td>
<td>15.3304</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>21.2913</td>
<td>12.2263</td>
<td>1.8154</td>
<td>36.0047</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>20.7575</td>
<td>11.1338</td>
<td>2.0163</td>
<td>44.3620</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>22.2763</td>
<td>12.7988</td>
<td>1.9419</td>
<td>41.4240</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the result of 't' test between the DPEP and
Non-DPEP schools by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

The table indicates 't' value of 38.31 at 0.01 significance is
significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate
assumption which means the classroom climate of DPEP schools is
significantly better than the classroom climate of Non-DPEP schools. The other dimensions like physical environment of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 15.33 at 0.01 level is significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Therefore the physical environment in DPEP schools is significantly better than the physical environment of None—DPEP schools.

Similarly, the academic environment of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools is compared. The 't' value of 36.00 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected and the other one is accepted. It means the academic environment in DPEP schools is significantly better than the academic environment of Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, the other dimension of class room climate is democratic approach in class is compared. The 't' value of 44.36 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means, the democratic approach in class of DPEP schools is significantly better than the democratic approach in class of Non –DPEP schools. In the same way this disorganization in class of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools is compared The 't' value of 41.42 at 0.01 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Which means disorganization in class of DPEP
schools is so better than the disorganization in class of Non-DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 5:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

**Table-21:** Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>86.2400</td>
<td>2.9524</td>
<td>57.3000</td>
<td>3.0203</td>
<td>48.4503 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>21.6100</td>
<td>1.3676</td>
<td>16.3900</td>
<td>0.7973</td>
<td>23.3170 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>21.3600</td>
<td>1.7614</td>
<td>13.7200</td>
<td>1.2254</td>
<td>25.1772 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>20.9000</td>
<td>0.6851</td>
<td>12.9000</td>
<td>1.1429</td>
<td>42.4535 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>22.3700</td>
<td>1.2114</td>
<td>14.2900</td>
<td>1.3213</td>
<td>31.8730 &lt;0.01 S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the result of t-test between the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

The table indicates 't' value of 48.45 at 0.01 significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption which means the urban area by classroom climate of DPEP schools is significantly better than the classroom climate of Non-DPEP schools. The other dimensions like urban area by physical environment...
of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 23.31 at 0.01 level is significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Therefore the physical environment in urban DPEP schools is significantly better than the physical environment of urban none—DPEP schools.

Similarly, the academic environment of urban DPEP and urban Non-DPEP schools is compared. The 't' value of 25.17 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected and the other one is accepted. It means the academic environment in of DPEP urban schools is significantly better than the academic environment of Urban Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, the other dimension of class room climate is democratic approach in class is compared. The 't' value of 42.45 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means, the democratic approach in class of urban DPEP schools is significantly better than the democratic approach in class of urban Non—DPEP schools. In the same way disorganization in class of urban DPEP and urban Non-DPEP schools is compared the 't' value of 31.87 at 0.01 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Which means disorganization in class of urban DPEP schools is better than the disorganization in class of urban Non-DPEP schools.
Sub Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

Table-22: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>81.3450</td>
<td>2.4280</td>
<td>42.1716</td>
<td>2.7178</td>
<td>76.3394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>17.3250</td>
<td>0.8954</td>
<td>10.6348</td>
<td>1.2735</td>
<td>30.4864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>21.2225</td>
<td>1.7426</td>
<td>10.7574</td>
<td>0.7891</td>
<td>39.0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>20.6150</td>
<td>0.8853</td>
<td>9.4387</td>
<td>0.8882</td>
<td>63.3277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>22.1825</td>
<td>1.2130</td>
<td>11.3407</td>
<td>1.1681</td>
<td>45.7580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the result of t-test between the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

The table indicates t value of 76.33 at 0.01 significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption which means the rural area by classroom climate of DPEP schools is significantly better than the classroom climate of Non-DPEP schools. The other dimensions like rural area by physical environment of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The t value of 30.48 at 0.01
level is significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Therefore the physical environment in rural DPEP schools is significantly better than the physical environment of rural non—DPEP schools.

Similarly, the academic environment of urban DPEP and rural Non-DPEP schools is compared. The 't' value of 39.00 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected and the other one is accepted. It means the academic environment in of DPEP rural schools is significantly better than the academic environment of rural Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, the other dimension of class room climate is democratic approach in class is compared. The 't' value of 63.32 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means, the democratic approach in class of rural DPEP schools is significantly better than the democratic approach in class of rural Non—DPEP schools. In the same way this organization in class of rural DPEP and rural Non-DPEP schools is compared the 't' value of 45.75 at 0.01 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means this organization in class of rural DPEP schools is better than the disorganization in class of rural Non-DPEP schools.
Sub Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions in high socio-economic status group.

Table-23: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in high socio-economic status group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=37)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=21)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>84.8243</td>
<td>55.2381</td>
<td>22.3095</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>20.1216</td>
<td>15.5952</td>
<td>6.7533</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>21.6351</td>
<td>13.2619</td>
<td>18.1235</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>21.0135</td>
<td>12.5000</td>
<td>25.2563</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>22.0541</td>
<td>13.8810</td>
<td>22.2371</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the result of 't' test between the DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimension in high socio-economic status group by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

The table indicates 't' value of 22.30 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted which means the high socio-economic status group by classroom climate of DPEP schools is significantly better than the classroom climate of Non-DPEP schools. The other dimensions like physical environment of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared.
The 't' value of 6.75 at 0.01 level is significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Therefore the physical environment in high socio status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the physical environment high socio status group of Non—DPEP schools.

Similarly, the academic environment of high socio status group of DPEP and high socio status group Non-DPEP schools is compared. The 't' value of 18.12 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected and the other one is accepted. It means the academic environment in of DPEP high socio status group schools is significantly better than the academic environment of high socio status group Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, the other dimension of classroom climate is democratic approach in class is compared. The 't' value of 25.25 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means, the democratic approach in class of high socio economic status group DPEP schools is significantly better than the democratic approach in class of high socio status group Non—DPEP schools. In the same way disorganization in class of high socio status group DPEP and high socio status group Non-DPEP schools is compared the 't' value of 22.23 at 0.01 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Which means disorganization in class of high socio status group DPEP schools so
better than the disorganization in class of high socio status group Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions in medium socio-economic status group.

Table-24: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in medium socio-economic status group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=41)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>83.1951</td>
<td>3.3126</td>
<td>50.2100</td>
<td>8.2852</td>
<td>23.9517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>19.1707</td>
<td>2.3200</td>
<td>13.7500</td>
<td>3.1546</td>
<td>9.1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>21.0122</td>
<td>1.7589</td>
<td>12.4200</td>
<td>1.8221</td>
<td>22.7327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>20.6098</td>
<td>0.8330</td>
<td>11.1700</td>
<td>2.0143</td>
<td>28.0814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>22.4024</td>
<td>1.2001</td>
<td>12.8700</td>
<td>1.9241</td>
<td>27.6085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the result of t-test between the DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimension in medium socio-economic status group by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

The table indicates a t-value of 23.95 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted which means the medium socio-economic status
group by classroom climate of DPEP schools is significantly better than the classroom climate of Non-DPEP schools. The other dimensions like physical environment of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 9.15 at 0.01 level is significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Therefore the physical environment medium socio status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the physical environment medium socio status group of Non—DPEP schools.

Similarly, the academic environment of medium socio status group of DPEP and medium socio status group Non-DPEP schools is compared. The 't' value of 22.73 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected and the other one is accepted. It means the academic environment in of DPEP medium socio status group schools is significantly better than the academic environment of medium socio status group Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, the other dimension of classroom climate is democratic approach in class is compared. The 't' value of 28.08 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means, the democratic approach in class of medium socio economic status group DPEP schools is significantly better than the democratic approach in class of medium socio status group Non—DPEP schools. In the same way this organization in class of medium socio status group
DPEP and medium socio status group Non-DPEP schools is compared with the t-value of 27.60 at 0.01 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Which means disorganization in class of medium socio status group DPEP schools is not so better than the disorganization in class of medium socio status grouping Non-DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 9:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions in low socio-economic status group.

**Table-25:** Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in low socio-economic status group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=22)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=29)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std.Dev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>83.1705</td>
<td>3.6281</td>
<td>44.4914</td>
<td>5.9072</td>
<td>27.0483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>18.9205</td>
<td>2.4194</td>
<td>11.3750</td>
<td>1.9916</td>
<td>12.2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>21.2330</td>
<td>1.7467</td>
<td>11.1422</td>
<td>1.3470</td>
<td>23.3094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>20.6023</td>
<td>0.8189</td>
<td>10.0819</td>
<td>1.5215</td>
<td>29.3229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>22.4148</td>
<td>1.1748</td>
<td>11.8922</td>
<td>1.8642</td>
<td>23.1829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the result of t-test between the DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their total attitude and its dimensions in low socio-economic status group.
dimension in low socio economic status group by classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

The table indicates 't' value of 27.04 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted which means the low socio economic status group by classroom climate of DPEP schools is significantly better than the classroom climate of Non-DPEP schools. The other dimensions like physical environment of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 12.21 at 0.01 level is significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Therefore the physical environment medium low status group of DPEP schools is significantly better than the physical environment low socio status group of Non—DPEP schools.

Similarly, the academic environment of low socio status group of DPEP and low socio status group Non-DPEP schools is compared. The 't' value of 23.30 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis rejected and the other one is accepted. It means the academic environment in of DPEP low socio status group schools is significantly better than the academic environment of low socio status group Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, the other dimension of classroom climate is democratic approach in class is compared. The 't' value of 29.32 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is
rejected and the alternate assumption is accepted. This means, the democratic approach in class of low socio economic status group DPEP schools is significantly better than the democratic approach in class of low socio status group Non -DPEP schools. In the same way this organization in class of low socio status group DPEP and low socio status group Non-DPEP schools is compared the t’value of 23.18 at 0.01 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means disorganization in class of low socio status group of DPEP schools is better than the disorganization in class of low socio status group of Non-DPEP schools.

**Major Hypothesis 4:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement scores (total)

**Table-26: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=100)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=100)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>Mean 36.1200</td>
<td>Std.Dev 2.2975</td>
<td>Mean 18.5900</td>
<td>Std.Dev 4.8494</td>
<td>t-value 32.6678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>Mean 90.1400</td>
<td>Std.Dev 5.2609</td>
<td>Mean 90.1400</td>
<td>Std.Dev 5.2609</td>
<td>t-value 0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>Mean 76.9000</td>
<td>Std.Dev 11.2927</td>
<td>Mean 54.1900</td>
<td>Std.Dev 13.1776</td>
<td>t-value 13.0860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the results of 't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement.
Looking into the table the 't' value of 32.66 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of infrastructure facilities. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means, the infrastructure facilities provided in DPEP schools are significantly better than the infrastructure facilities provided in Non-DPEP schools. Similarly, intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools and Non-DPEP schools are compared. The 't' value of 00.00 at 0.05 levels of significance is not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools is not so better than the children studying in Non-DPEP schools. Coming to the academic achievement of the children studying in DPEP schools and Non-DPEP schools, the 't' value of 13.08 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, where as the alternate one is accepted. It means that the achievement level of the children studying in DPEP schools is significantly better than the achievement level of the children studying in Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement scores.
Table-27: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area by Infrastructure facilities, Intelligence Quotient and Academic Achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>36.9400</td>
<td>21.3200</td>
<td>20.4476</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>89.9800</td>
<td>89.9800</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>87.4400</td>
<td>65.1200</td>
<td>21.1460</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the results of t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area by infrastructure facilities, intelligence quotient and academic achievement.

Looking into the table the t-value of 20.44 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of infrastructure facilities of urban area schools. Hence, the null hypotheses is formulated is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means, the infrastructure facilities provided in DPEP urban schools are significantly better than the infrastructure facilities provided in Non-DPEP urban schools. Similarly, intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP urban schools and Non-DPEP schools and Non-DPEP urban schools are compared. The t-value of 00.00 at 0.05 levels of significance is not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP urban schools is not so better than the children studying in Non-DPEP urban schools. Coming to the academic achievement of the children studying in DPEP urban schools and Non-DPEP urban schools, the t-value of 21.14 at 0.01 level of significance is
significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, where as the alternate one is accepted. It means that the achievement level of the children studying in DPEP urban schools is significantly better than the achievement level of the children studying in Non-DPEP urban schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 11:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area with respect to their Infrastructure Facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement scores

**Table-28: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area by Infrastructure Facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>35.3000</td>
<td>16.0588</td>
<td>36.1191</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>90.3000</td>
<td>90.1176</td>
<td>0.1704</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>66.3600</td>
<td>43.0000</td>
<td>18.0133</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the results of 't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area by infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement.

Looking into the table the 't' value of 36.11 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of infrastructure facilities of rural area schools. Hence, the null hypotheses is formulated is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means, the infrastructure facilities provided in DPEP rural schools are significantly better than the infrastructure facilities provided in Non-DPEP rural schools. Similarly, intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP rural schools and
Non-DPEP schools and Non-DPEP rural schools are compared. The 't' value of 0.00 at 0.05 levels of significance is not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP rural schools is not so better than the children studying in Non-DPEP rural schools. Coming to the academic achievement of the children studying in DPEP rural schools and Non-DPEP rural schools, the 't' value of 18.01 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, whereas the alternate one is accepted. It means that the achievement level of the children studying in DPEP rural schools is significantly better than the achievement level of the children studying in Non-DPEP rural schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 12:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement scores in high socio-economic status group

**Table-29: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement in high socio-economic status group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>36.5946</td>
<td>22.1905</td>
<td>14.0889</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>89.3784</td>
<td>90.1905</td>
<td>-0.5702</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>79.0000</td>
<td>61.3810</td>
<td>5.9470</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows the results of student’s ‘t’ test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement in high socio economic status group.

Looking into the table the ‘t’ value of 14.08 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of infrastructure facilities in high socio economic status group area schools. Hence, the null hypotheses is formulated is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means, the infrastructure facilities provided in DPEP schools of high socio economic status group are significantly better than the infrastructure facilities provided in Non-DPEP schools of high socio economic status group. Similarly, intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools of high socio economic status group and Non-DPEP schools of high socio economic group are compared. The ‘t’ value of -0.57 at 0.05 levels of significance is not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools of high socio economic status group is not so better than the children studying in Non-DPEP schools of high socio economic groups. Coming to the academic achievement of the children studying in DPEP schools of high socio economic group and Non-DPEP schools of high socio economic groups the ‘t’ value of 5.94 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, where as the alternate one is accepted. It means that the achievement level of the children studying in DPEP schools of high socio economic status group is
significantly better than the achievement level of the children studying in Non-DPEP schools of high socio economic status group.

**Sub Hypothesis 13:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement scores in medium socio-economic status group

**Table-30:** Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement in medium socio-economic status group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=41)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=50)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>35.6829 2.3285</td>
<td>18.7400 4.7929</td>
<td>20.7054</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>89.7073 5.7326</td>
<td>89.9000 5.0558</td>
<td>-0.1703</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>76.0488 10.5023</td>
<td>56.0400 12.6652</td>
<td>8.0876</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement in medium socio economic status group.

Looking into the table the t-value of 20.70 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of infrastructure facilities in medium socio economic status group area schools. Hence, the null hypotheses is formulated is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means, the infrastructure facilities provided in DPEP schools of medium socio economic status group, are significantly better than the infrastructure
facilities provided in Non-DPEP schools of medium socio economic status group. Similarly, intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools of medium socio economic status group and Non-DPEP schools of medium socio economic group are compared. The 't' value of -0.17 at 0.05 levels of significance is not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools of medium socio economic status group is not so better than the children studying in Non-DPEP schools of medium socio economic groups. Coming to the academic achievement of the children studying in DPEP schools of medium socio economic group and Non-DPEP schools of medium socio economic groups the 't' value of 8.08 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, where as the alternate one is accepted. It means that the achievement level of the children studying in DPEP schools of medium socio economic status group is significantly better than the achievement level of the children studying in Non-DPEP schools of medium socio economic status group.

**Sub Hypothesis 14:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement scores in low socio-economic status group
Table-31: Results of student t-test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent Quotient and Academic Achievement in low socio-economic status group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DPEP (n=22)</th>
<th>Non-DPEP (n=29)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>36.1364 2.0070</td>
<td>15.7241 1.9982</td>
<td>36.0629</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>92.2273 4.6181</td>
<td>90.5172 5.3826</td>
<td>1.1932</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>74.9545 13.1854</td>
<td>45.7931 11.5430</td>
<td>8.4034</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the results of student 't' test between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools by infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and academic achievement in low socio-economic status group.

Looking into the table the 't' value of 36.06 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of infrastructure facilities in medium socio-economic status group area schools. Hence, the null hypotheses is formulated is rejected and the alternative one is accepted, which means, the infrastructure facilities provided in DPEP schools of low socio-economic status group are significantly better than the infrastructure facilities provided in Non-DPEP schools of low socio-economic status group. Similarly, intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools of low socio-economic status group and Non-DPEP schools of low socio-economic group are compared. The 't' value of 1.19 at 0.05 levels of significance is not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means the intelligent quotient of the children studying in DPEP schools of low socio-economic status group is not so better than the
children studying in Non-DPEP schools of low socio economic groups. Coming to the academic achievement of the children studying in DPEP schools of low socio economic group and Non-DPEP schools of low socio economic groups the 't' value of 8.40 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected, where as the alternate one is accepted. It means that the achievement level of the children studying in DPEP schools of low socio economic status group is significantly better than the achievement level of the children studying in Non-DPEP schools of low socio economic status group.

4.3 Analysis of covariance:
To know the interaction effect of teachers’ attitude with respect to location and SES of the DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. The investigator carried out analysis of co-variance.

Major Hypothesis 5: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their attitude scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers.
Table-32: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on teacher’s attitude scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3042.2935</td>
<td>3042.2935</td>
<td>10.0897</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2908.4734</td>
<td>1454.2367</td>
<td>4.8229</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1871.0540</td>
<td>935.5270</td>
<td>3.1027</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>58495.8607</td>
<td>301.5251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>66317.6815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it is quite clear that, the results of two way analysis of co-variance between location and SES on teachers’ attitude scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. In each case the ‘F’ value is significant at 0.01 level of significance. When location taken with attitude the ‘F’ value of 10.08 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted. This means the location and the SES both effects directly, significantly with teachers’ attitude of DPEP and the Non-DPEP schools. The location and SES have direct effect on the attitude of the teachers.

When two way interaction effects of location and SES were considered the ‘F’ value of 3.10 at 0.05 levels of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Which means both the SES and location directly interacts with the attitude of teachers.
Table-33: Scheffe’s multiple comparison tests between location and SES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location x SES</th>
<th>Urban x High</th>
<th>Urban x Medium</th>
<th>Urban x Low</th>
<th>Rural x High</th>
<th>Rural x Medium</th>
<th>Rural x Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>74.17073</td>
<td>69.11459</td>
<td>75.81818</td>
<td>74.47059</td>
<td>60.58139</td>
<td>56.85000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban x High</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban x Medium</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban x Low</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural x High</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural x Medium</td>
<td>&lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural x Low</td>
<td>&lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly shows that, the urban medium SES has no significant relation where as rural medium SES with urban high SES has significant results. Similarly, rural low SES with that of urban high SES have significant results and also rural low SES and urban medium SES, rural low SES and rural high SES and has significant relationship.

Sub Hypothesis 15: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their attitude scores of DPEP school teachers.
Table-34: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on teacher's attitude scores of DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>441.1224</td>
<td>441.1224</td>
<td>68.7613</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1318</td>
<td>3.5659</td>
<td>0.5558</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3193</td>
<td>4.1597</td>
<td>0.6484</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>603.0351</td>
<td>6.4153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1059.6086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the hypothesis two way analysis of co-variance between location and SES on teachers’ attitude scores of DPEP schools alone were carried out. The table shows that, the location of DPEP schools has direct influence on attitude of DPEP teachers, where as SES has no significant results. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Similarly, when two way interaction effects of location and SES were carried out this yielded no significance results. It means the SES and location of DPEP school teachers' attitude has very little effect.

Similarly, the same type of observation was carried for Non-DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 16:** There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their attitude scores of Non-DPEP school teachers.
Table-35: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on teacher's attitude scores of Non-DPEP schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3211.6172</td>
<td>3211.6172</td>
<td>488.8036</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.8567</td>
<td>6.4283</td>
<td>0.9784</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0260</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>617.6141</td>
<td>6.5704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3842.1140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly indicates that the location of Non-DPEP schools has direct influence on the attitude of Non-DPEP teachers. Where as SES has no significance result. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and another one is accepted. Similarly, when two way interaction effects on location and SES were carried out, which yielded no significance results? It means the SES and location of Non-DPEP schools has very little effect on the attitude of teachers.

To know the interaction effect of class room climate with respect to location and SES of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. The investigator carried out analysis of co-variance.

**Major Hypothesis 6**: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their classroom climate scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.
Table-36: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on classroom climate scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2912.3752</td>
<td>2912.3752</td>
<td>9.9496</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2797.8298</td>
<td>1398.9149</td>
<td>4.7791</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1841.4857</td>
<td>920.7429</td>
<td>3.1456</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>56786.1765</td>
<td>292.7122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>64337.8672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is quite clear that, the results of two way analysis of co-variance between location and SES on the class room climate scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. In each case the ‘F’ value is significant at 0.01 level of significant. When we consider location with class room climate the ‘F’ value of 9.98 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted. This means that the location and the SES both effects directly and interact significantly with the classroom climate of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. The location and the SES have direct effect on classroom climate.

When two way interaction effects of location and SES were considered the ‘F’ value of 3.14 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Which means both the location and SES directly interact with the class room climate.
The table indicates Scheffe’s multiple comparison tests between location and SES. It clearly shows that, the urban medium SES has no significant relation. Whereas rural medium SES with urban high SES have significant results. Similarly, rural low SES with that of urban high SES has significant results. Also rural low SES and rural high SES have significant relationship.

To test the hypothesis the two way analysis of co-variance between location and SES on class room climate of DPEP schools alone were carried out.

**Sub Hypothesis 17**: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their classroom climate scores of DPEP schools.
Table-38: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on classroom climate scores of DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>490.5222</td>
<td>490.5222</td>
<td>67.0134</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5185</td>
<td>8.2592</td>
<td>1.1283</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.3848</td>
<td>3.6924</td>
<td>0.5044</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>688.0575</td>
<td>7.3198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1202.4830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly shows that, the location of DPEP schools has direct influence on classroom climate of DPEP schools. Whereas SES have no significant results. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and another one is accepted. Similarly, two way interaction effects of location and SES were carried out. It yielded no significant results which mean the SES and location of DPEP schools has very little effect on classroom climate.

Similarly, same type of observation was carried for Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 18: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their classroom climate scores of Non-DPEP schools.
Table-39: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on classroom climate scores of Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2950.5239</td>
<td>2950.5239</td>
<td>436.7453</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.4952</td>
<td>4.7476</td>
<td>0.7028</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6910</td>
<td>0.3455</td>
<td>0.0511</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>635.0365</td>
<td>6.7557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3595.7466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly shows that, the location of Non-DPEP schools has directly influence on the class room climate of Non-DPEP schools. Where as SES has no significant result. Hence null hypothesis is rejected and the one is accepted. Similarly, two way interaction effects on location and SES was carried out which yielded no significant results. It means the SES and location of Non-DPEP schools has very little effect on the classroom climate.

To know the interaction effect of location of SES with respect to intelligent quotient scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP school students, the investigator carried out analysis of co-variance.

**Major Hypothesis 7:** There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium. Low) with respect to intelligent quotient scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students
Table-40: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on IQ scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.6242</td>
<td>29.6242</td>
<td>1.0957</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157.1796</td>
<td>78.5898</td>
<td>2.9967</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>148.0808</td>
<td>74.0404</td>
<td>2.7385</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5245.2018</td>
<td>27.0371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5580.0864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the results of two-way analysis of co-variance between the location and SES on intelligent quotient scores of the children of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. When we considered location with intelligent quotient, the ‘F’ value of 1.09 at 0.05 levels of significance is not significant. Where as SES has significant effect on intelligent quotient scores. The two ways interaction effect of location and SES were considered the effect is not so significant. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted which means there is no significant effect of location and SES with respect to intelligent quotient scores of the children of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 19:** There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to intelligent quotient scores of DPEP schools students.
Table 41: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on IQ scores of DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.0963</td>
<td>14.0963</td>
<td>0.5309</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179.7643</td>
<td>89.8821</td>
<td>3.3853</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way interaction effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118.7565</td>
<td>59.3782</td>
<td>2.2364</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2495.7634</td>
<td>26.5507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2808.3805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that the results of two way analysis covariance between location and SES on intelligent quotient scores of DPEP schools. Location with intelligent quotient is not so significant; where as the SES with intelligent quotient is more significant. The 'F' value of 3.38 at 0.05 level of significance is significant. The two ways interaction effect of location and SES were considered the effect is not significant. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted which means there is no significance effect of location and SES on the intelligent quotient scores of the children of DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 20:** There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to intelligent quotient scores of Non-DPEP schools students.
Table-42: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on IQ scores of Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.6090</td>
<td>10.6090</td>
<td>0.3720</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2973</td>
<td>9.1486</td>
<td>0.3208</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way interaction effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.4998</td>
<td>25.7499</td>
<td>0.9029</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2680.7343</td>
<td>28.5184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2761.1404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the results of two way analysis of covariance between location and SES on intelligence quotient scores of the students of Non-DPEP schools. Location and SES have no significant effect on the intelligent quotient scores of the student of Non-DPEP schools. Hence null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significance effect location and SES on the intelligent quotient scores of the students of Non-DPEP schools.

To know the interaction effect of location and SES with respect to academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP school students, the investigator carried out analysis of co-variance.

**Major Hypothesis 8:** There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students.
The table indicates that the results of two way analysis of covariance between location and SES on the academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP school children. When we take location with academic achievement of the children is significant. The ‘F’ value of 116.15 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. The SES has no significant effect on academic achievement scores. The two way interaction effect of location and SES were considered the ‘F’ value of 5.70 at 0.05 levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. It means that there is significant effect of location and SES on the academic achievement scores of the children of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.
Table 44: Scheffe's multiple comparison tests between location and SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location x SES</th>
<th>Urban x High</th>
<th>Urban x Medium</th>
<th>Urban x Low</th>
<th>Rural x High</th>
<th>Rural x Medium</th>
<th>Rural x Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>76.92683</td>
<td>73.93750</td>
<td>84.09091</td>
<td>62.23529</td>
<td>55.13953</td>
<td>51.30000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban x High</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban x Medium</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban x Low</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural x High</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural x Medium</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural x Low</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows Schffe's multiple comparison tests between location and SES. It indicates clearly that, the rural high SES with urban low SES, rural medium SES, urban medium SES and urban low SES have significance results. Similarly, rural low SES with urban medium SES and urban low SES also have significant results. In the same way rural low SES with that of urban medium and urban low SES have significant relationship.

Sub Hypothesis 21: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to academic achievement scores of DPEP schools students
Table-45: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on academic achievement scores of DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10782.8184</td>
<td>10782.8184</td>
<td>860.2731</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>194.1403</td>
<td>97.0701</td>
<td>7.7444</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233.1584</td>
<td>116.5792</td>
<td>9.3009</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1178.2131</td>
<td>12.5342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12388.3301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that results of two way analysis of covariance between location and SES with respect to academic achievement scores of the students of DPEP schools. The location and SES have significant effect on the achievement scores. The 'F' value of 860.27 at 0.01 level of significance is significant in respect of location. In the same way the 'F' value of 7.74 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant in respect of SES. The two ways interaction effect is also significant the 'F' value of 9.30 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted. It means the effect and location and SES is more significant on the academic achievement scores of the students of DPEP schools.
Table-46: Scheffe’s multiple comparison tests between location and SES-DPEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location x SES</th>
<th>Urban x High</th>
<th>Urban x Medium</th>
<th>Urban x Low</th>
<th>Rural x High</th>
<th>Rural x Medium</th>
<th>Rural x Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>87.21739</td>
<td>85.60000</td>
<td>93.42857</td>
<td>65.50000</td>
<td>66.95238</td>
<td>66.33334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrbanxHigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrbanxMedium</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrbanxLow</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RuralxHigh</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RuralxMedium</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RuralxLow</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It shows Scheef’s multiple comparison tests between location and SES. It indicates clearly that, the urban low SES and urban medium SES and rural high SES with that of urban medium and urban low SES have significant results. Similarly, rural medium SES with urban medium and urban low SES have positive relationship. In the same way rural low SES with that of urban medium and urban low SES have significance relationship.

Sub Hypothesis 22: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools students

Table-47: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5387.5967</td>
<td>5387.5967</td>
<td>99.2197</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9456</td>
<td>1.9728</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111.2925</td>
<td>55.6462</td>
<td>1.0248</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5104.1705</td>
<td>54.2997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10607.0053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicates the results of two way analysis of co-variance between location and SES on the academic achievement scores of the children belonging Non-DPEP schools. Location has little significance where as SES has no significance on the achievement scores. The two way interaction effect is also not so significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted which means there is no significant interaction effect of location and SES on the academic achievement scores of the students of Non-DPEP schools.
4.4 Correlational Analysis

In the present study there are five source (independent) variables such as teachers' attitude, classroom climate, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and socio economic status and only one dependent variable is academic achievement of DPEP and Non-DPEP school students. As a prerequisite for the in-depth analysis it is essential to study the relationship between independent variables and dependent variable (i.e. academic achievement scores). Hence in the present context the focus is on the study of the relationship between these variable.

In order to investigate the relations of independent variables with dependent variable (academic achievement) of DPEP and Non-DPEP school students. Pearson's correlation coefficient technique was applied and simple relationships were obtained. In order to test the significance of obtained 'r's the appropriate test was used.

The investigator wanted to know the co-relation coefficient values of total teachers' attitude and its dimension of DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers.

Major Hypothesis 9: There is no significant relationship between teachers' attitude scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools teachers.
Table-48: Correlation coefficient between attitude scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Teaching Learning process</th>
<th>Teacher Student relationship</th>
<th>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</th>
<th>Total Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>0.7980 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>0.8340 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>0.9590 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>0.7950 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>0.9320 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>0.9720 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>0.8880 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>0.9690 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>0.9880 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>0.9720 &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates correlation coefficient of teaching learning process and physical facilities, the value of 0.798 at 0.05 levels of significance is significant. Similarly, teachers' students' relationship and physical facilities is 0.834, the school educational, social and cultural environment and physical facilities is found to be 0.795 at 0.05 levels of significance is significant. The total of all the dimensions to that of physical facilities alone is compared. The value of 0.888 is found to be significant at 0.05 levels of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and another one is accepted. This clearly shows that, there is direct relationship of all the dimensions like physical facilities, teaching learning facilities, teacher student relationship and school educational, social and cultural environment when compared with only the physical
facilities. Similarly, when other dimensions are taken and compared one at a time, the total attitude is found to be significant in each case which means the teacher attitude directly related to the other dimensions directly or indirectly.

**Sub Hypothesis 23:** There is no significant relationship between teachers' attitude scores and its dimensions of DPEP school teachers.

**Table-49: Correlation coefficient between attitude scores and its dimensions of DPEP school teachers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Teaching Learning process</th>
<th>Teacher Student relationship</th>
<th>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</th>
<th>Total Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Learning process</td>
<td>0.0630, &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Student relationship</td>
<td>0.0150, &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>0.3480, &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>-0.0580, &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-0.1460, &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>0.2290, &lt;0.05, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>0.7260, &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.5780, &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.4720, &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.2700, &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates correlation coefficient of physical facilities and teaching learning process the value of 0.063 found to be not so significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Similarly, physical facilities and teacher student relationship is 0.015 and physical facilities and school educational social and cultural environment found to be -0.058 levels of significance is not so significant. The total of all the variables to
that of physical facilities alone is considered the value of 0.726 at 0.1 levels of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and other one is accepted. This clearly shows that, there is direct relationship of all the variables like physical facilities, teaching learning process, teacher student relationship and school educational social cultural environment when compared only with physical facilities. Similarly, when the other variables are taken and compared one at a time the total attitude found to be significant in each case. Which means the teacher attitude is directly related to the other dimensions directly or indirectly.

**Sub Hypothesis 24:** There is no significant relationship between teachers' attitude scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools teachers.

**Table-50: Correlation coefficient between attitude scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools teachers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Teaching Learning process</th>
<th>Teacher Student relationship</th>
<th>School educational, Social &amp; cultural environment</th>
<th>Total Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning process</td>
<td>0.8210 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher student relationship</td>
<td>0.9040 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>0.8350 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School educational, social &amp; cultural environment</td>
<td>0.7560 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>0.7460 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>0.8260 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attitude</td>
<td>0.9550 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>0.9060 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>0.9620 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>0.8830 &lt;0.01,S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table indicates the correlation coefficient values between the teachers' attitude and its dimensions themselves of Non-DPEP school teachers. Correlation coefficient of teaching learning process and physical facilities the value of 0.21 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Similarly, teachers' student relationship and physical facilities is found to be 0.904 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. The total of all the dimension to that of physical facilities alone is compared the value of 0.955 is found to be significant at 0.1 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. This clearly shows that, there is direct relationship of all the dimensions when compared only with physical facilities. Similarly, when other dimensions are compared one at a time the total attitude found to be significant in each case which means the teacher attitude is directly related to the other dimensions of the teacher attitude directly or indirectly.

Similarly the investigator wished to know the correlation coefficient values between total classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. **Major Hypothesis 10:** There is no significant relationship between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.
Table-51: Correlation coefficient between total classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Physical environment</th>
<th>Academic environment</th>
<th>Democratic approach in class</th>
<th>Disorganization in class</th>
<th>Class room climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>0.8057 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>0.8383 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.9581 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>0.8013 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.9314 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.9667 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>0.8923 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.9696 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.9871 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.9716 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the correlation coefficient of physical environment and academic environment the value of 0.8057 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Similarly, physical environment and democratic approach in class and physical environment and democratic approach in class is found to be 0.838 and physical environment and disorganization in class is found to be 0.801 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. The total of all the dimensions to that of physical environment alone is 0.892 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative one is accepted. It clearly shows that there is direct relationship of all the dimensions when compared only with physical environment. Similarly the other dimensions are compared one at a time the total class room climate
found to be significant in each case. It means the class room climate is directly related to other dimensions of class room climate directly or indirectly.

**Sub Hypothesis 25**: There is no significant relationship between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP schools.

**Table-52: Correlation coefficient between total classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Physical environment</th>
<th>Academic environment</th>
<th>Democratic approach in class</th>
<th>Disorganization in class</th>
<th>Class room climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>0.0650</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>0.1520</td>
<td>0.4338</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>-0.0270</td>
<td>-0.0803</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>0.7254</td>
<td>0.5908</td>
<td>0.5831</td>
<td>0.3112</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the correlation coefficient values between total class room climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP schools. The correlation coefficient of physical environment and academic environment, physical environment and democratic approach in class, physical environment and disorganization in class values are not so significant. The total of all the dimensions to that of physical environment alone is 0.725 at 0.01 level of significance is significant.
Hence, null hypothesis is rejected. It shows that there is direct relationship of all the dimensions when compared only with physical environment. Similarly, the other dimensions are taken and compared one at a time the total value is found to be significant in each case. It means class room climate is related to other dimensions directly or indirectly.

**Sub Hypothesis 26:** There is no significant relationship between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools.

**Table-53: Correlation coefficient between total classroom climate scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Physical environment</th>
<th>Academic environment</th>
<th>Democratic Approach in class</th>
<th>Disorganization in class</th>
<th>Class room climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic environment</td>
<td>0.8106</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic approach in class</td>
<td>0.8665</td>
<td>0.7876</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganization in class</td>
<td>0.7309</td>
<td>0.7393</td>
<td>0.7962</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate</td>
<td>0.9471</td>
<td>0.9003</td>
<td>0.9402</td>
<td>0.8763</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the correlation coefficient values between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools. The correlation coefficient of physical environment and academic environment is 0.810 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Similarly
physical environment and democratic approach, physical environment and disorganization in class are found to be significant at 0.01 levels of significant. The total of all the dimensions to that of physical environment alone is 0.947 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and another one is accepted. It shows that, there is direct relationship of all the dimensions when compared only with physical environment. Similarly, the other dimensions are compared one at a time. The total class room climate scores is found to be significant in each case. It means class room climate is related to the other dimensions directly or indirectly.

The investigator desired to know correlation coefficient between independent variables like attitude scores, class room climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and dependent variable i.e., academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP students.

**Major Hypothesis 11:** There is no significant relationship between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools
Table-54: Correlation coefficient between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Classroom climate</th>
<th>Infrastructure facilities</th>
<th>Intelligently quotient</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Academic achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>0.9980</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>-0.0200</td>
<td>-0.0210</td>
<td>0.0380</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-0.2680</td>
<td>-0.2650</td>
<td>-0.2680</td>
<td>0.1090</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>0.8280</td>
<td>0.8270</td>
<td>0.7490</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>-0.3160</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates correlation coefficient of attitude and classroom climate of the value of 0.998 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Similarly, attitude and infrastructure facilities are 0.929 and attitude and IQ is -0.02 and attitude and SES to be 0.268 at 0.1 level of significance is significant. The total of all independent variables to that of academic achievement is found to be 0.82 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and another one is accepted, which means all the independent variables are inter related to one another and found to be significant on academic achievement except IQ. Similarly, when the other independent variables like classroom
climate, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and SES are taken and compared one at a time, the total academic achievement is found to be significant in each case except IQ. It means all the independent variables are related to one another directly or indirectly.

**Sub Hypothesis 27:** There is no significant relationship between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of DPEP School.

**Table-55: Correlation coefficient between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of DPEP schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Classroom climate</th>
<th>Infrastructure facilities</th>
<th>Intelligent quotient</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Academic achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>0.9477 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>0.3432 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.3378 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>0.0319 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>0.0599 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>0.1850 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-0.1907 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-0.1898 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-0.0999 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>0.1879 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>0.6705 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.6635 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.3676 &lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.1510 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>0.1424 &gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows, correlation coefficient of attitude and classroom climate the value of 0.947 found to be significant at 0.01 level
of significance. In the same way attitude and infrastructure facilities is 0.343, attitude and intelligent quotient is 0.031, attitude and SES is -0.190 at 0.05 levels of significance. The total of all independent variables to that of academic achievement is found to be 0.670 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative one is accepted, which means all the independent variables are inter related to one another and found to be significant on academic achievement. Except IQ and SES Similarly, when other independent variables are taken and compared one at a time the total academic achievement is significant in each case except IQ and SES. It means, all the independent variables are related to one another directly or indirectly.

**Sub Hypothesis 28:** There is no significant relationship between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools.
Table-56: Correlation coefficient between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Classroom climate</th>
<th>Infrastructure facilities</th>
<th>Intelligent quotient</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Academic Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>0.9940</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities</td>
<td>0.5290</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.5260</td>
<td>0.0610</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient</td>
<td>-0.1000</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-0.1210</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-0.4760</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>-0.4680</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>0.8220</td>
<td>&lt;0.01, S</td>
<td>0.8200</td>
<td>0.4720</td>
<td>0.4280</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the correlation coefficient of attitude and classroom climate the value of 0.994 is found to be significant at 0.01 levels of significance. Similarly, attitude and infrastructure is 0.529, attitude and SES is 0.476 and attitude and IQ is -0.100 at 0.5 levels of significance is not so significant. The total of all independent variables to that of academic achievement is found to be 0.822 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate one is accepted. It means that, all the independent variables are inter related to one another and found to be significant on academic
achievement except IQ. Similarly when all the other independent variables are compared one at a time the total academic achievement found to be significant in each case except IQ and SES. It means all the independent variables are interrelated to one another directly or indirectly.
4.5 Regression Analysis

The significant zero-order correlation between factors affecting the academic achievement of students on the one hand and their independent variables like attitude, class room climate, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and SES on the other cannot be taken to be final and ultimate. This can be due to the zero-order correlation between any two variables being their common dependence upon a third or several other variables.

The most commonly used procedure in the prediction of a continuous criterion variable is the multiple linear regression models. Weights are known, as regression coefficients are determined for each predictor variable. The resulting sum of squares on the composite of these variables will show the highest possible relationship (multiple correlations) with the criterion variable.

The commonly applied computational procedures for multiple linear regressions, which have now been made feasible by electronic computers. In this method, multiple correlation coefficients reveal the degree of relation between linear combination of independent (or predictor) variable and respective dependent (or criterion) variable.

In this method, multiple correlations and multiple linear regressions reveal the degree to which each independent variable is related to academic achievement (dependent or criterion). To identify this type of relationship between independent variable on the one hand
and the academic achievement on the other hand, the multiple correlations and multiple regression analysis were carried out.

The investigator wanted to know the relative joint effects of independent variables i.e., attitude scores, class room climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of DPEP and Non-DPEP school children.

**Major Hypothesis 12:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students.

**Table-57: Regression coefficients and multiple correlations coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>SE of beta</th>
<th>Reg Coefficient</th>
<th>SE of reg Coef</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.2229</td>
<td>11.8441</td>
<td>-0.4410</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.6603</td>
<td>0.6807</td>
<td>0.5949</td>
<td>0.6133</td>
<td>0.9699</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.3337</td>
<td>0.6810</td>
<td>0.3056</td>
<td>0.6236</td>
<td>0.4900</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.2092</td>
<td>0.1070</td>
<td>-0.3656</td>
<td>0.1870</td>
<td>-1.9548</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.0901</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>0.2870</td>
<td>0.1262</td>
<td>2.2751</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.1160</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
<td>-2.6234</td>
<td>0.9210</td>
<td>-2.8484</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R= 0.8409, R²= 0.7072, Adjusted R²=0.6997, F=93.7430, p<0.001, S, SE: 9.1599
The table indicates regression co-efficient and multiple co-relation co-efficient of all the independent variables on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of DPEP and Non-DPEP school students. The 't' value of attitude of teachers is 0.96 at 0.05 levels of significance is no significant. Similarly the classroom climate is 0.49 which is also not significant. It means there is no significant joint effect of attitude of teachers and classroom climate on the achievement of students of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools. But where as other independent variables like infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and SES are considered, they are found to be significant which means the students of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools, academic achievement is effected by the infrastructure facilities, IQ and SES of students. This also gives an idea that due to good infrastructure facilities, IQ and SES of students, academic achievement is better. Hence, the relative contribution of the selected independent variable on academic achievement of both DPEP and Non-DPEP schools are considered.
Table-58: Relative contribution of some selected independent variables on dependent variable (i.e., Academic achievement) – DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.6603</td>
<td>0.8283</td>
<td>0.5469</td>
<td>77.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.3337</td>
<td>0.8272</td>
<td>0.2761</td>
<td>39.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.2092</td>
<td>0.7489</td>
<td>-0.1567</td>
<td>-22.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.0901</td>
<td>0.0495</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.1160</td>
<td>-0.3156</td>
<td>0.0366</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table gives the value of the same. The above table clearly explains that the attitude of teachers contributes 77.32 percent where as classroom climate contributes 39.0 percent and infrastructure facilities – 22.15% which means low infrastructure facilities low academic achievement. This is found more in Non-DPEP schools. Intelligent quotient contributes 0.63 percent because there is a direct co-relation between IQ and academic achievement. The SES of students also contributes 5.18 percent. On the whole we may conclude that attitude of the teachers working in both types of schools place important role. Next to it is classroom climate. The infrastructure facilities, which is a free requisite thing to any school.

In order to know the relative effects of the independent variable like attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities scores and SES scores on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement
of students in DPEP schools separately. Hence, regression analysis and regression co-efficient were carried out.

**Major Hypothesis 13:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of DPEP schools students.

**Table-59: Regression coefficients and multiple correlations coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>SE of beta</th>
<th>Reg Coefficient</th>
<th>SE of reg Coef</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-135.5790</td>
<td>25.1613</td>
<td>-5.3884</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.4025</td>
<td>0.2330</td>
<td>1.3200</td>
<td>0.7643</td>
<td>1.7272</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.2260</td>
<td>0.2326</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>0.7208</td>
<td>0.9714</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.1306</td>
<td>0.0802</td>
<td>0.6420</td>
<td>0.3943</td>
<td>1.6277</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>0.0772</td>
<td>0.2280</td>
<td>0.1657</td>
<td>1.3747</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.0296</td>
<td>0.0770</td>
<td>-0.4420</td>
<td>1.1486</td>
<td>-0.3847</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R= 0.6985, R²= 0.4880, Adjusted R²= 0.4607, F= 17.9200, p<0.001, S, SE: 8.2923

The above mentioned table indicates the values are not so significant at 0.05 levels of significance in each case. It means independent variables have no joint effect on dependent variable. Since there is more positive attitude and good classroom climate with required infrastructure facilities, the students might have shown good
performance. The intelligent quotient and SES are not so important, considering to the above variables. This clearly shows that in DPEP set up teachers having high attitude maintaining good class room climate, the DPEP schemes has provided good other facilities which yielded good academic achievement.

When the percentage contribution with respect to each independent variables on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement is calculated and provided in the table.

**Table-60: Relative contribution of some selected independent variables on dependent variable (i.e., Academic achievement) –DPEP schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.4025</td>
<td>0.6705</td>
<td>0.2699</td>
<td>55.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.2260</td>
<td>0.6635</td>
<td>0.1499</td>
<td>30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.1306</td>
<td>0.3676</td>
<td>0.0480</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>0.1510</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.0296</td>
<td>-0.1424</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above mentioned table clearly shows its contribution percentage at 55.29, classroom climate 30.72, infrastructure facilities 9.84, intelligent quotient 3.28 and SES 0.87. Infrastructure facilities contributes less because the government has provided all the facilities
prior to the entry of the students due to good attitude and classroom climate with infrastructure facilities, students achieve better.

**Major Hypothesis 14:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of Non-DPEP schools students.

**Table-61:** Regression coefficients and multiple correlations coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>SE of beta</th>
<th>Reg Coefficient</th>
<th>SE of reg Coef</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-26.9345</td>
<td>16.0637</td>
<td>-1.6767</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.4067</td>
<td>0.5593</td>
<td>0.6267</td>
<td>0.8619</td>
<td>0.7272</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.3930</td>
<td>0.5587</td>
<td>0.6359</td>
<td>0.9040</td>
<td>0.7034</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>0.0719</td>
<td>0.0698</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
<td>0.3572</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.0839</td>
<td>0.0599</td>
<td>0.2102</td>
<td>0.1501</td>
<td>1.4002</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.0410</td>
<td>0.0688</td>
<td>-0.7655</td>
<td>1.2835</td>
<td>-0.5965</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R= 0.8282, R²= 0.6859, Adjusted R²= 0.6692, F=41.0720, p<0.001, S, SE: 7.5781

The above table shows the regression analysis of all the independent variables on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of Non-DPEP school students. All the values are not significant at 0.05 levels of significant. It means that, all the independent variables have no joint effect on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement. Since,
there is no positive attitude of teachers and good class room climate for
the children in Non-DPEP schools, the performance is affected. Similarly,
the schools have not been provided with good infrastructure facilities like
that of DPEP schools. The intelligent quotient and SES of the children
remains the same of DPEP school children. Hence, there is no
significance effect of all these independent variables on the dependent
variables i.e., academic achievement of these children.

Relative contribution of the independent variables on dependent
variable i.e., academic achievement is calculated and provided in the
Table No. 53.

**Table-62: Relative contribution of some selected independent
variables on dependent variable (i.e., Academic
achievement) -Non-DPEP schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.4067</td>
<td>0.8200</td>
<td>0.3335</td>
<td>48.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.3930</td>
<td>0.8200</td>
<td>0.3223</td>
<td>47.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>0.4700</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.0839</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.0410</td>
<td>-0.4300</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly shows that contribution of attitude of
teachers and class room climate is 48.65% and 47.01% respectively. On
the other hand the other variables like infrastructure facilities, intelligent
quotient and SES have contributed better for the academic achievement of the children.

The investigator intends to know the joint effect of independent variables i.e., attitude scores, class room climate scores, infrastructure facilities scores, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of urban DPEP schools students separately. Hence, regression analysis and regression coefficient were carried out.

**Sub Hypothesis 29:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of Urban DPEP schools students.

**Table-63:** Regression coefficients and multiple correlation coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement (Urban DPEP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>St. Err.of BETA</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>St. Err.of B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4185</td>
<td>20.3987</td>
<td>1.0010</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.1600</td>
<td>0.2296</td>
<td>0.2938</td>
<td>0.4217</td>
<td>0.6969</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>-0.1211</td>
<td>0.2354</td>
<td>-0.2076</td>
<td>0.4034</td>
<td>-0.5146</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.0033</td>
<td>0.1106</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
<td>0.3533</td>
<td>-0.0295</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.6725</td>
<td>0.1165</td>
<td>0.6485</td>
<td>0.1124</td>
<td>5.7718</td>
<td>&lt;0.05, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.1324</td>
<td>0.1116</td>
<td>0.9402</td>
<td>0.7925</td>
<td>1.1864</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.7094, R^2 = 0.5032, Adjusted R^2 = 0.4468, F = 8.9165, p < 0.001, S, SE: 3.7630
The above table indicates the joint effect of all independent variables on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of the students studying in urban DPEP schools. All the values are not so significant except IQ and SES of the students. It clearly shows that, the IQ and SES of the children have significant value for the academic achievement of the children of urban DPEP schools. In the meanwhile attitude of the teachers, class room climate and infrastructure facilities of urban DPEP schools have not so significant value on the academic achievement of children. Still these independent variables are also playing an important role on the academic achievement of the children.

**Table-64: Relative contribution of some selected independent variables on dependent variable (i. Academic achievement) (Urban of DPEP).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>'R'</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.1600</td>
<td>0.1316</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>-0.1211</td>
<td>0.1615</td>
<td>-0.0196</td>
<td>-3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.0033</td>
<td>0.1639</td>
<td>-0.0005</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.6725</td>
<td>0.6945</td>
<td>0.4671</td>
<td>92.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.1324</td>
<td>0.2663</td>
<td>0.0353</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It represents the percentage contribution with respect to each independent variable on the dependent variable i.e., academic achievement. Here the contribution of independent variable like attitude
of the teachers is 4.18 percent, the intelligent quotient is 92.81 percent and SES is 7.01 percent. The attitude of the teachers is all together different by way of various training programme undergone under DPEP intervention. The intelligent quotient and SES of the students have contributed a great deal on academic achievement. The other variables like class room climate and infrastructure facilities which were provided under DPEP scheme might not have contributed a lot on the academic achievement of the children. But it is one of the factors and objective of DPEP intervention.

**Sub Hypothesis 30**: There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of rural DPEP schools students.

**Table-65: Regression coefficients and multiple correlations coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement (Rural of DPEP).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>St. Err.of BETA</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>St. Err.of B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.1559</td>
<td>13.5950</td>
<td>3.8364</td>
<td>&lt;0.05, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.2115</td>
<td>0.4004</td>
<td>0.2167</td>
<td>0.4101</td>
<td>0.5283</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>-0.1708</td>
<td>0.3981</td>
<td>-0.1626</td>
<td>0.3788</td>
<td>-0.4291</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.0031</td>
<td>0.1508</td>
<td>-0.0027</td>
<td>0.1337</td>
<td>-0.0205</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.2371</td>
<td>0.1507</td>
<td>0.1029</td>
<td>0.0654</td>
<td>1.5738</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>0.1480</td>
<td>0.2662</td>
<td>0.4447</td>
<td>0.5986</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.2832, R² = 0.0802, Adjusted R² = 0.0000, F = 0.7675, p > 0.05, NS, SE: 2.3381
The above table shows joint effect of all the independent variables on dependent variable on academic achievement of the students of rural DPEP schools. All the values are not so significant accept the intelligent quotient of the children. It means that, the IQ of the children remains the same. The other independent variables like attitude of the teachers, classroom climate, infrastructure facilities and SES of the children have also contributed positively on the academic achievement of the children, since it is due to the positive effect of the DPEP intervention. The attitude of the teachers and zeal might have contributed more. The class room climate and infrastructure facilities provided by DPEP intervention place an important role in this respect.

**Table-66: Relative contribution of some selected independent variables on dependent variable (i.e. Academic achievement)**

(Rural of DPEP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.2115</td>
<td>0.0546</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>-0.1708</td>
<td>0.0202</td>
<td>-0.0034</td>
<td>-4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.0031</td>
<td>0.0529</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.2371</td>
<td>0.2549</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>75.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>0.1337</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>14.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0802</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table shows the percentage contribution of all the independent variables on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of the children of rural DPEP schools. Independent variable teachers’ attitude
contributed 14.3 percent, intelligent quotient 75.3 percent and SES 14.77 percent respectively. Whereas classroom climate and infrastructure facilities have not contributed so much as it was accepted. The intelligent quotient of the children remains very high. The attitude of the teachers is changed due to the various training programme imparted under the DPEP schemes. Therefore, a percentage contribution of teachers' attitude is very much.

Similarly, the investigator likes to know the relative effect of independent variables i.e., attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on dependent variables i.e., academic achievement of urban Non-DPEP schools students and rural Non-DPEP school students separately. The regression analysis and regression coefficient were carried out.

**Sub Hypothesis 31:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of urban non-DPEP schools students.
The above table indicates the joint effect of all the independent variables on the dependent variables i.e., academic achievement of the children studying in urban Non-DPEP schools. All the values are not significant accept the IQ of the children and SES. It clearly shows that, the intelligent quotient and SES of the children contributed more where as the other variables like attitude of the teachers, classroom climate, and infrastructure facilities have not contributed significantly.
Table-68: Relative contribution of some selected independent variables on dependent variable (i.e. Academic achievement) (Urban of NON-DPEP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.1075</td>
<td>0.0961</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
<td>0.0988</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.0523</td>
<td>-0.0943</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.4512</td>
<td>0.3963</td>
<td>0.1788</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.2307</td>
<td>0.2123</td>
<td>0.0490</td>
<td>19.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table represents, the percentage contribution with respect to each independent variable on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement. Here, the percentage contribution of independent variables like classroom climate and infrastructure facilities have not influenced on the academic achievement of the children. The percentage of contribution of attitude of teachers is 4.12 percent, intelligent quotient is 71.25 percent and SES is 19.35 percent. It clearly shows that, the IQ of the children remains same as that of DPEP schools where as the attitude of the teachers and SES of the children is comparatively more here.

Sub Hypothesis 32: There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of rural non-DPEP schools students.
Table-69: Regression coefficients and multiple correlations
coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement (Rural of NON-DPEP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>St. Err.of BETA</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>St. Err.of B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.7281</td>
<td>45.6062</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
<td>1.2702</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.1727</td>
<td>0.2807</td>
<td>0.7814</td>
<td>1.2702</td>
<td>0.6152</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.2964</td>
<td>0.4727</td>
<td>1.2822</td>
<td>0.3686</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.1149</td>
<td>0.1453</td>
<td>0.4247</td>
<td>0.5371</td>
<td>0.7906</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>-0.0701</td>
<td>0.1647</td>
<td>-0.1155</td>
<td>0.2713</td>
<td>-0.4257</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.1658</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>-2.3789</td>
<td>2.1511</td>
<td>-1.1059</td>
<td>&gt;0.05, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R= 0.3496, R²=0.1222, Adjusted R²= 0.0224, F=1.2254. P>0.05, NS, SE: 8.6719

The above table indicates the joint effect of all the independent variables on dependent variables i.e., academic achievement of the children of rural Non-DPEP schools. All the values are not so significant except attitude of teachers and SES of children which means all the independent variables have not so significant on the academic achievement of the children studying in rural Non-DPEP schools.
Table-70: Relative contribution of some selected independent variables on dependent variable (i.e. Academic achievement) (Rural of NON-DPEP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>Beta x r</th>
<th>% of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.1727</td>
<td>0.2557</td>
<td>0.0442</td>
<td>36.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.2566</td>
<td>0.0280</td>
<td>22.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.1149</td>
<td>0.1302</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>-0.0701</td>
<td>-0.1787</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.1658</td>
<td>-0.1359</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table represents the percentage of contribution with respect to each independent variable on dependent variable i.e., academic achievement of the children. The percentage contribution of all the independent variables on academic achievement is as mentioned below.

Attitude of the teachers is 36.13 percent, classroom climate is 22.92 percent, infrastructure facilities 12.24 percent, and intelligent quotient 10.25 percent and SES is 18.25 percent. It clearly shows the attitude of the teachers and SES of the children contributed more on the academic achievement of the children studying in these schools.
4.6 Path Analysis

To know the true relationship between dependent variables i.e., academic achievement with that of independent variables like attitude of the teachers, classroom climate, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient and SES path analysis was carried out by the investigator.

In simple, multiple regression analysis, empathizes was on the study of the extent to which the dependent variable[s] get affected by the contribution of the independent variable(s) on original scales measurements being standardized for comparison of the scores with the studies being carried out by others with the same variable(s). The regression coefficients obtained carrying out simple, multiple regression analysis was found to get affected by the unit of measurement. In other words, the values of the regression coefficients of the variables get affected with the change of unit of measurement of the variable(s). In order to understand the true relation between the dependent and independent variables it becomes necessary to have regression coefficients independent of the unit of measurement of the variables. This is achieved by both the dependent and the independent variables being standardized as: \( Z = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} \) with \( \mu \) and \( \sigma \) being the mean and the standard deviation of the variable \( X \). It is evident that the standardized variable \( Z \) has meant zero (0) and standard deviation (1) (Garrett, 1981. PP.313). with the standardized variables, the regression coefficients will
be having the same values as that of the corresponding correlation coefficients. The regression coefficients are directional in the sense that they indicate the direction of the direction in the form of independent variable as the cause of the corresponding dependent variable. Thus, the regression coefficients in the regression models of the standardized variables have come to be named path (directional) coefficients, with the path (direction) being from an independent variable towards the corresponding dependent variable. Hence the regression analysis carried out with the help of standardized variables has come to be known as path analysis. It is worth that, one value of the path coefficients as regression coefficients of the standardized variables, are the same in their values as those of the corresponding correlation coefficients. In the magnitude, the path coefficients are directional, but correlation coefficients are not directional. Though both are independent of the units of measurement of the corresponding variables.

Added advantage of path analysis over multiple linear regression analysis is that of finding the direct and indirect effects of the independent variables on the corresponding dependent variable. In general, a variable can have its effect being revealed by the magnitude and the direction of the path coefficient of the independent variable. It can also have an effect on the dependent variable by the virtue of its relation with another independent variable. Thus, the effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable as received by the path
The coefficient of the independent variable is known as direct effect of the independent variable. On the other hand, the effect of an independent variable through another variable is termed as indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

**Figure-1: Direct and Indirect paths**

In the above figure, $P_1$ is the direct effect of $X_1$ on $Y$, $p_2$ is the indirect effect of $X_1$ on $Y$ through $X_2$ and $p_2$ is direct effect of $X_2$ on $Y$.

A variable not exerting direct effect on the dependent variable may exert indirect effect on the dependent variable through an independent variable. Such phenomena hold well in many situations.

**Figure-2: Indirect paths through intermediately variables**

In the above figure $X_1$, $X_2$, and $X_3$ are the independent variables each having direct effect as well as indirect effect on the dependent variables $Y$. The variables $u_1$, $u_2$, $u_3$, $v_1$, and $v_2$ are also the independent
variables with only indirect effect on Y through some or all of the
independent variables X₁, X₂, and X₃ as indicated in the figure 2. In
such situations the variables X₁, X₂, and X₃ are called the intermediately
variables between Y and u₁, u₂, u₃, v₁, and v₂.

From the above narration it is evident that a variable can have only
direct effect, only indirect effect and both direct and indirect effects on a
dependent variable or variables.

The details of selected significant direct and indirect of
independent variables and academic achievement of senior secondary
school students in physical sciences with their interrelations is given in
the following table and figures:

**Direct and Indirect Paths from Independent Variables to Academic
Achievement Variables**

Multiple regression analysis of standardized independent and
academic achievement variable was carried out to identify direct and
indirect paths (effects) from each of the independent variable to the
academic achievement variable. The regression coefficient of
independent variable having significant direct path with an academic
achievement variable was considered as indirect path from the source
independent variable to the academic achievement variable through the
other independent variable having direct effect. The actual values of
indirect paths were to be obtained as partial correlation coefficients
among the independent variables but it was beyond the scope of the study.

The following table presents the statistically significant direct and indirect paths from each of the independent variables to academic achievement variable.

**Major Hypothesis 15:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, and SES and scores on academic achievement of students of DPEP + Non-DPEP schools.

**Table-71 : The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of DPEP + Non-DPEP schools (n=200).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-2.62**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level of significance (p<0.01)

** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.05)

The above table clearly indicates that teachers attitude is directly related to academic achievement. Hence, the null hypothesis formulated
in this respect is rejected and the alternate one is accepted. Similarly, the classroom climate and academic achievement is compared. The value of 0.31 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Similarly, the infrastructure facilities and academic achievement is compared due to direct effect at a value of 0.37 is significant at 0.05 levels of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and another one is rejected. Similarly, another variable intelligent quotient is compared with academic achievement the value 0.29 at 0.05 levels of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and another one is accepted. Similarly SES is compared with academic achievement the value 2.62 is significant at 0.05 levels of significant.

**Figure-3:** The direct and indirect path coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores) on academic achievement of students
To know the actual path, how the independent variables affect the dependent variable of the study.

Figure No.- 1 represents the independent variables are explanatory variables, gives path of direct effects on academic achievement. If we see carefully, it is quite clear that both academic achievement and classroom climate, IQ and infrastructure facilities are having indirect effect as well as direct effect on academic achievement. Both these variables have direct effect on academic achievement whereas IQ and SES have only direct effects on academic achievement.

The investigator carried out path analysis taking DPEP and Non-DPEP schools separately to know the direct and indirect path effects on academic achievement.

**Major Hypothesis 16:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of DPEP schools
Table-72: The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of total of (U+R) DPEP schools (n=100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>1.32**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level of significance (p<0.01)
** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.05)

The above table indicates that the attitude of the teachers of DPEP schools have significantly and directly affected on academic achievement. The value of 1.32 at 0.05 level of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Similarly, classroom climate and academic achievement is compared and found to be significant. The value of 0.70 at 0.01 level of significance is significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. In the same way when the infrastructure facilities and IQ is compared with academic achievement the value of 0.64 and 0.3 at 0.05 level of significance is found to be significant. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. Similarly when SES and academic achievement is compared the value of 0.44 at 0.5 levels of significance is significant. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected and the
other one is accepted which means it has direct effect on academic achievement.

The investigator formulated figural representation of direct and indirect paths of variables which effects on academic achievement. **Figure-4:** The direct and indirect path coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment (explanatory) variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Academic Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Quotient (X4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figure clearly indicates that, the IQ and SES have direct and indirect effect on academic achievement. Similarly, attitude of teachers and class room climate have both direct and indirect effects on
academic achievements. But, IQ and infrastructure facilities have changed relationship on academic achievement.

**Sub Hypothesis 33:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of urban DPEP schools.

**Table-73: The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of urban DPEP schools (n=50)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through X1 X2 X3 X4 X5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.65*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level of significance (p<0.01)
** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.05)
*** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.01)

The above table shows that, the IQ of the students of urban DPEP schools has significant and direct effect on academic achievement. The value of 0.65 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Similarly, when classroom climate and attitude of teachers is compared with academic achievement the value 0.84 at 0.01
levels of significance is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is accepted. Similarly, the attitude of the teachers is compared with classroom climate on academic achievement. The value of 0.92 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Similarly, SES and IQ is compared on academic achievement, the value is 1.75 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. In the same way, IQ and SES are compared with academic achievement the value of 0.04 at 0.10 level of significance is significant. Hence null hypothesis is rejected and other one is accepted, which means these variables have direct and indirect effect on academic achievement.
The above figure shows that, the IQ and SES have both direct and indirect effect on academic achievement. Similarly, attitude of teachers and infrastructure facilities have direct effect on academic achievement. In the same way class room climate and infrastructure facilities of both direct and indirect effect on academic achievement. IQ and SES are linked each other on both of them have direct effect on academic achievement.
**Sub Hypothesis 34:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of rural DPEP schools

**Table-74: The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of rural DPEP schools (n=50).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through XI X2 X3 X4 X5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Significant at 1 percent level of significance (p<0.01)

The above table indicates that, attitude of the teachers have direct effect on academic achievement. The value of 0.22 at 0.01 levels of significance is significant. Similarly the classroom climate has direct effect on academic achievement in the same way IQ and SES have direct relationship with academic achievement. Class room climate with attitude, class room climate and attitude are closely related with each other. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the other one is
accepted, which means all the independent variables have direct effect on academic achievement.

**Figure-6:** The direct and indirect path coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment (explanatory) variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Quotient (X4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>Academic Achievement (Y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figure clearly indicates that, attitude of the teachers has direct relationship with classroom climate and both of them have direct effect on academic achievement. Similarly, infrastructure facilities have effect on academic achievement directly. In the same way IQ and SES have direct effect on academic achievement on the children.
Major Hypothesis 17: There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of Non-DPEP schools

Table-75: The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of total of (U+R) of Non-DPEP schools (n=50).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through XI X2 X3 X4 X5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class room climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level of significance (p<0.01)
** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.05)

The above table clearly indicates that, class room climate is directly related to academic achievement. IQ and class room climate are related and have indirect effect on academic achievement. The value of 0.3 at 0.5 level of significance is significant. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected. Similarly, SES is related to class room climate the value is 1.91 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. Similarly, class room climate and attitude of teachers are related to each other. The value of 1.25 and 1.07 at 0.05 level of significance are significant. Therefore both of them...
have significant and direct effect on academic achievement. Similarly, infrastructure facilities, and SES are related to each other.

**Figure-7: The direct and indirect path coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students.**

The above figure represents the independent variables are explanatory and gives path of direct effects on academic achievement. If we see the figure carefully it is quite clear that attitude of the teachers classroom climate and infrastructure facilities are having direct effect on academic achievement. Attitude and intelligent quotient are quite related and have direct effect on academic achievement. Infrastructure facilities
and SES are closely related to classroom climate and in term they are directly affected on academic achievement. In same way IQ and SES have direct effect on academic achievement on the children.

**Sub Hypothesis 35:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of urban Non-DPEP schools

**Table-76: The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of urban Non-DPEP schools (n=50).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level of significance (p<0.01)

** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.05)

The above table clearly indicates that the attitude of the teacher and SES are directly related to academic achievement. Similarly, classroom climate and IQ are also related to academic achievement. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and other one is accepted. Classroom climate and attitude of teachers are closely related to each other.
Simultaneously, SES and infrastructure facilities are interdependent if the value of 2.77 at 0.05 levels of significance is significant. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. It means both of them have positive effect on academic achievement.

**Figure-8:** The direct and indirect path coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, Infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores) on academic achievement of students

The above figure represents the relationship of independent variables on dependent variables. IQ and SES have both direct and indirect effect on academic achievement. Similarly, attitude of the teachers and class room climate are interdependent. Both of them along
with infrastructure facilities have direct effect on academic achievement. But SES and infrastructure facilities are inter dependent and have direct effect on academic achievement.

**Sub Hypothesis 36:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of rural Non-DPEP schools

Table-77: The direct and indirect path coefficients of independent variables (attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores) on academic achievement of students of rural Non-DPEP schools (n=50).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement (Y)</td>
<td>Attitude (X1)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82* 0.07 0.44 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom climate (X2)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.84* 0.05 -1.64** 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure facilities (X3)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01 0.01 0.32 -0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent quotient (X4)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.02 -0.07** 0.08 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES (X5)</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>0.13 0.13 -0.79 1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level of significance (p<0.01)
** Significant at 5% level of significance (p<0.05)

The above table shows that the attitude of teachers is directly related to academic achievement. Therefore null hypothesis is rejected. Similarly, classroom climate and academic achievement is concerned the value is 0.42 at 0.01 levels of significance. Similarly, infrastructure facilities and academic achievement is concerned due to direct effect the
value of 0.42 at 0.01 level of significance is significant. In the same way the other variables like, IQ and SES are compared. The values at 0.12 and 2.38 at 0.01 levels of significance are significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative one is accepted. This means these variables have positive effect on academic achievement.

**Figure-9: The direct and indirect path coefficients of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, and SES scores) on academic achievement of students.**

The above figure represents the influence of independent variables like attitude of teachers; class room climate and intelligent quotient have effect on academic achievement directly and indirectly. In the same way, IQ and SES have direct effect on academic achievement. In the same
way infrastructure facilities also has positive effect on academic achievement on the children.

**Major Hypothesis:** There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to infrastructure facilities scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students

**Table-78: Results of two-way analysis of covariance between location and SES on infrastructure facilities scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Signi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>212.1676</td>
<td>212.1676</td>
<td>2.5387</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1032.1302</td>
<td>516.0651</td>
<td>6.1751</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interaction effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc x SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>378.8235</td>
<td>189.4117</td>
<td>2.2664</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>16212.9988</td>
<td>83.5722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>17836.1202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teachers' total attitude and its dimensions scores.

**Sub Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers of urban area with respect to their teachers' total attitude and its dimensions scores.
Sub Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers of rural area with respect to their teachers’ total attitude and its dimensions scores.

Major Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teacher’s total attitude and its dimensions in high socio-economic group.

Sub Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teachers’ total attitude and its dimensions in medium socio-economic group.

Sub hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers with respect to their teachers’ total attitude and its dimensions in low socio-economic group.

Major Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

Sub Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

Sub Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions scores.

Sub Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions in high socio-economic group.
Sub Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions in medium socio-economic group.

Sub Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP school with respect to their total classroom climate and its dimensions in low socio-economic group.

Major Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent quotient and Academic achievement scores (total).

Sub Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of urban area with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent quotient and Academic achievement scores.

Sub Hypothesis 11: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools of rural area with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent quotient and Academic achievement scores.

Sub Hypothesis 12: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent quotient and Academic achievement scores in high socio-economic group.

Sub Hypothesis 13: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent quotient and Academic achievement scores in medium socio-economic group.
Sub Hypothesis 14: There is no significant difference between DPEP and Non-DPEP schools with respect to their Infrastructure facilities, Intelligent quotient and Academic achievement scores in low socioeconomic group

Major Hypothesis 5: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their attitude scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP school teachers

Sub Hypothesis 15: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their attitude scores of DPEP school teachers

Sub Hypothesis 16: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their attitude scores of Non-DPEP school teachers.

Major Hypothesis 6: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their classroom climate scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 17: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their classroom climate scores of DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 18: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to their classroom climate scores of Non-DPEP schools.
Major Hypothesis 7: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to intelligent quotient scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students

Sub Hypothesis 19: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to intelligent quotient scores of DPEP schools students

Sub Hypothesis 20: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to intelligent quotient scores of Non-DPEP schools students

Major Hypothesis 7a: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to infrastructure facilities scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students

Major Hypothesis 8: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students

Sub Hypothesis 21: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to academic achievement scores of DPEP schools students

Sub Hypothesis 22: There is no significant interaction effect of location (Urban, Rural) and SES (High, Medium, Low) with respect to academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools students
Major Hypothesis 9: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ attitude scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools teachers.

Sub Hypothesis 23: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ attitude scores and its dimensions of DPEP schools teachers.

Sub Hypothesis 24: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ attitude scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools teachers.

Major Hypothesis 10: There is no significant relationship between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 25: There is no significant relationship between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 26: There is no significant relationship between classroom climate scores and its dimensions of Non-DPEP schools.

Major Hypothesis 11: There is no significant relationship between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

Sub Hypothesis 27: There is no significant relationship between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of DPEP schools.
Sub Hypothesis 28: There is no significant relationship between attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores and academic achievement scores of Non-DPEP schools.

Major Hypothesis 12: There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores, SES scores on academic achievement of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools students.

Major Hypothesis 13: There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of DPEP schools students.

Major Hypothesis 14: There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of Non-DPEP schools students.

Sub Hypothesis 29: There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of Urban DPEP schools students.
**Sub Hypothesis 30:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of rural DPEP schools students.

**Sub Hypothesis 31:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of urban non-DPEP schools students.

**Sub Hypothesis 32:** There is no significant joint effect of independent variables i.e. attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of rural non-DPEP schools students.

**Major Hypothesis 15:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of DPEP and Non-DPEP schools.

**Major Hypothesis 16:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities,
intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of DPEP schools

**Sub Hypothesis 33:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of urban DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 34:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of rural DPEP schools.

**Major Hypothesis 17:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of total of Non-DPEP schools.

**Sub Hypothesis 35:** There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of urban Non-DPEP schools.
**Sub Hypothesis 36**: There is no significant direct and indirect effect of attitude scores, classroom climate scores, infrastructure facilities, intelligent quotient scores and SES scores on academic achievement of students of rural Non-DPEP schools.

The investigator interrupted the data, the findings and discussions of results in detail is presented in the next chapter-V.