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CHAPTER - VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Perfection is an ideal and like all other ideals it has to remain unattained. The investigator passed through different situations. The constraints put by reality force the investigator to make compromises.

The present chapter deals with various steps taken by the investigator to complete the research, glancing observations made while the study was in progress and the conclusions made on the basis of the data obtained along with the suggestions for further work on the line.

6.1. SUMMARY:

The present study, as its title indicates, is concerned with the study of attitude towards national integration. Therefore, it was the first and foremost task to define attitude and national integration and than to make a systematic assessment of attitude towards national integration of the students. The preparation of a valid and reliable attitude test was the need for the systematic assessment.
In the present report the investigator showed the area of the sample. To have a clear idea about the attitude, national integration and the definitions of the terms, the objectives of the study and its limitations have been discussed in the beginning of this report. The investigator has made an attempt to describe and discuss the developing concept of attitude and national integration, different methods of measuring attitude, practicability of measuring attitude and selection of the right method. After discussing the theoretical aspects of the attitudes, the related researches were reviewed which gave an insight to the investigator in the field of attitude measurement. This study also helped the investigator in preparing valid and reliable attitude scale for measuring attitude of students towards national integration.

Passing through the various steps for the construction of the attitude scale, experts were consulted for 125 statements initially prepared by the investigator and 23 statements out of 125 were selected on the basis of quartile and t-value techniques. The necessary steps taken are discussed in the chapter III. The reliability of the attitude scale has been determined by Test-retest method, split-half method, parallel form method, Rulon method and Flanagan formula. The concurrent validity and construct validity of the test was also found out which is reported in chapter IV.
Besides these, the investigator has also made certain observations during the administration of the attitude scale.

6.2. FINDINGS:

At the time of administering the scale, it was found that students were quite co-operative and eager to know the result of their own scores towards national integration. Some of them seemed to be deeply engrossed in choosing the appropriate response category of the statements describing behaviour characteristics largely identical to the behaviour. They were reading the statements of the scale with keen interest. Many of the students were taking such scale for the first time and hence it was observed that the students were very sincere in giving the responses. Especially, the Girls and Rural students took too much interest.

The teachers of the students also gave their opinion about the scale and they also took interest in administering the scale. After explaining usefulness of the scale to the teachers they extended their fullest cooperation in providing facilities for smooth administration of the scale. Most of the teachers remained present during the administration work and partly worked as proctors. On the whole right from the collection of the statements to
the final administration of the scale co-operation from different centres was encouraging.

6.3. **STATISTICAL FINDINGS:**

In standardization of the scale, the reliability and validity of the scale were found; and data analysis made and found as under:

6.3.1. **Findings on Standardization of the Scale:**

The reliability of the scale of the present study has been established by test-retest method, split-half method, parallel form method, Rulon method and Flanagan formula.

6.3.1.1. **Reliability of the scale:**

**Data:** The coefficient of correlations found by different methods were as under:

(1) Test-retest method : \( r = 0.79 \)
(2) Split-half method : \( r = 0.77 \)
(3) Parallel form method : \( r = 0.73 \)
(4) Rulon method : \( r = 0.774 \)
(5) Flanagan formula : \( r = 0.772 \)

**Finding:** The correlations found by different methods are in the range from 0.73 to 0.79. According to the norm.
The value of $r$ from $\pm 0.70$ to $\pm 1.00$ means high to very high positive or negative correlation depending upon $+$ve or $-$ve sign.

**Conclusion:** The correlation found by different methods are obviously high which means that attitude scale is reliable one.

### 6.3.1.2. Validity of the scale:

The validity of the scale of the present study has been established by construct validity and concurrent validity methods.

**Data:** The coefficient of correlation between students attitude scores and teachers opinion about students was as under:

\[
\text{Concurrent validity method } r^* = 0.6345
\]

**Finding:** The correlation found by concurrent method is substantially positive.

**Conclusion:** The correlation found by concurrent method is substantially positive which means that attitude scale is valid one.

### 6.3.2. Findings on Data Analysis:

On the basis of data analysis made in chapter VI, the following observations and conclusions were made study-wise. They are briefly described here.
Study - 1: The percentage of students having high, average and low attitude towards national integration:

Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of the students</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Score range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students of the whole group</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.1710</td>
<td>55-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students having high attitude</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>92.5332</td>
<td>86-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students having average attitude</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>81.1212</td>
<td>77-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students having low attitude</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>71.2286</td>
<td>55-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding: The number of students, percentage and mean decreases from high to low attitude.

Conclusion:

(1) The scoring remained between 55 and 115.

(2) The greater No. of students from sample having high attitude i.e. 39.2% of students having high attitude

(3) The No. of students having average and low attitude is less than the No. of students having high attitude i.e. 36.3% and 24.5% of students having average and low attitude respectively.
6.3.2.2. Study - 2: Correlation between independent and dependent variables:

H₁ : There is no significant correlation between the scores on IQ test and scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of respondents.

Data: The coefficient of correlation

\[ r_{ob.} = -0.0321 \quad \text{NS} \]

Finding: The built up null hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion:

1. The correlation is not significant and hence the alternative hypothesis - there is significant correlation between the scores on IQ test and scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of respondents - was rejected.

2. The coefficient of correlation appeared with negative sign revealed inverse negligible relationship between IQ and attitude.

H₂ : There is no significant correlation between the scores on SES scale and scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of the respondents.
Data: The coefficient of correlation $r_{ob} = -0.2360$
$\quad r_{tab} = 0.062^*$  $r_{tab} = 0.081^{**}$

Finding: The built up null hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion:
(1) The correlation is significant and hence the alternative hypothesis - there is significant correlation between the scores on SES scale and scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of the respondents - was accepted.

(2) The coefficient of correlation appeared with negative sign revealed inverse relationship between SES and Attitude.

$H_3$: There is no significant correlation between the scores on achievement test and scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of the respondents.

Data: The coefficient of correlation
$\quad r_{ob} = -0.0676  \quad r_{tab} = 0.062^*$

Finding: The built up null hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion:
(1) The significant correlation leads to accept that there is significant correlation between the scores on achievement test and scores on
measurement of attitude towards national integration, of the respondents.

(2) The coefficient of correlation appeared with negative sign revealed inverse relationship between Achievement and Attitude.

6.3.2.3. Study - 3: Significance of mean difference:

Intelligence V/s Attitude:

$H_4$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of low IQ group and high IQ group.

Data: $CR_{obs} = 2.145$  $CR_{tab} = 1.96^*$

$M_1 = 84.0286$  $M_2 = 82.2167$

Finding: The built up null hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion:

(1) Hence the hypothesis now reads as - There is significant difference between the mean scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of the low IQ group and high IQ group, which means that the difference is significant and the attitude of low IQ group is comparatively higher than the high IQ group.
H₅ : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of low IQ Boys and low IQ Girls group.

Data: \( \text{CR}_{\text{obs.}} = 2.89 \quad \text{CR}_{\text{tab.}} = 1.96^{*} \)
\[ \text{CR}_{\text{tab.}} = 2.58^{**} \]
\[ M_1 = 86.7821 \quad M_2 = 82.7425 \]

Finding: The built up null hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the hypothesis now reads as there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of low IQ Boys group and low IQ Girls group, which means that the difference is significant and the attitude of low IQ Boys group is comparatively higher than the low IQ Girls group.

H₆ : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high IQ Boys group and high IQ Girls group.

Data: \( \text{CR}_{\text{obs.}} = 1.0149 \quad \text{NS} \quad \text{CR}_{\text{tab.}} = 1.96 \)
\[ \text{CR}_{\text{tab.}} = 2.58 \]
\[ M_1 = 81.7766 \quad M_2 = 82.8296 \]
**Finding:** The built up null-hypothesis was not rejected.

**Conclusion:** (1) Hence the research hypothesis is rejected which reads as: there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high IQ boys group and high IQ girls group, it means that the difference is not significant and there is no comparative difference in attitude between high IQ Boys and high IQ Girls groups.

H<sub>7</sub> : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high IQ Boys and low IQ Boys group.

**Data:**

- CR<sub>obs.</sub> = 3.7692
- CR<sub>tab</sub> = 1.96*
- CR<sub>tab</sub> = 2.58**

- M<sub>1</sub> = 81.7766
- M<sub>2</sub> = 86.7821

**Finding:** The built up null hypothesis was rejected.

**Conclusion:** (1) Hence the hypothesis now reads as - There is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high IQ Boys group and low IQ Boys groups which means that the difference is significant and the attitude of low IQ Boys group is comparatively higher than the high IQ Boys group.
H₈ : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high IQ Girls group and low IQ Girls group.

Data: $CR_{obs.} = 0.0764 \text{ NS } CR_{tab} = 1.96$

$CR_{tab} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 82.8296 \quad M_2 = 82.7425$

Finding: The built up null-hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the research hypothesis is rejected which reads as - there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high IQ Girls group and low IQ Girls group it means that the difference is not significant and there is no comparative difference in attitude between high IQ Girls group and low IQ Girls group.

6.3.2.4. Study - 4: Significance of mean difference: Socio-Economic Status V/s Attitude:

H₉ : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration of low SES group and high SES group.
Data: \( CR_{obs} = 1.3545 \) NS \( CR_{tab} = 1.96 \)
\[ CR_{tab} = 2.58 \]
\[ M_1 = 82.5560 \quad M_2 = 83.7958 \]

Finding: The constructed null hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the research hypothesis reads as: there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of low SES group and high SES group is now rejected, it means that the difference is not significant and there is no comparative difference in attitude between low SES group and high SES group.

\( H_{10} \): There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of low SES Boys group and low SES Girls group.

Data \( CR_{obs.} = 2.0360 \) \( CR_{tab} = 1.96^* \)
\[ M_1 = 83.9027 \quad M_2 = 81.2773 \]

Finding: The constructed null-hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the hypothesis is now reads as - there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards
national integration, of low SES Boys group and low SES Girls group which means that the difference is significant and the attitude of low SES Boys group is comparatively higher than the low SES Girls group.

$H_{11}$: There is no significant difference between mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high SES Boys group and high SES Girls group.

**Data:** $\text{CR}_{\text{obs}} = 0.6521 \quad \text{NS} \quad \text{CR}_{\text{tab}} = 1.96$

$\text{DR}_{\text{tab}} = 2.56$

$M_1 = 83.6260 \quad M_2 = 83.3856$

**Finding:** The built up null-hypothesis was not rejected.

**Conclusion:**

(1) Hence the alternative hypothesis - there is significant difference between mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration of high SES Boys group and high SES Girls group - was rejected and

(2) The difference is not significant and there is no comparative difference in attitude between high SES Boys group and high SES Girls group.
H_{12} : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high SES Boys group and low SES Boys group.

Data: \( CR_{obs} = 0.2284 \) NS \( CR_{tab} = 1.96 \)

Finding: The built up null-hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the alternative hypothesis - there is significant difference between mean scores, on measurement of attitude of attitude towards national integration, of high SES Boys group and high SES Girls group - was rejected, it means that the difference is not significant and there is no comparative difference in attitude between high SES Boys and low SES Boys group.

H_{13} : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high SES Girls group and low SES Girls group.

Data: \( CR_{obs} = 2.4954 \) \( CR_{tab} = 1.96^* \)

Finding: The constructed null-hypothesis was rejected.
Conclusion: (1) Hence the hypothesis now reads as: there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high SES Girls group and low SES Girls group which means that the difference is significant and the attitude of high SES Girls group is comparatively higher than the low SES Girls group.

6.3.2.5. Study – 5: Significance of mean difference:
Achievement V/s Attitude:

H_{14} : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration of low achievement group and high achievement group.

Data: \( CR_{\text{obs}} = 2.0779 \quad CR_{\text{obs}} = 1.96^* \)

\[ M_1 = 83.5588 \quad M_2 = 81.8304 \]

Finding: The null-hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the accepted hypothesis now reads as: there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration of low achievement group and high achievement group which means that the difference is significant and the attitude of low achievement group is comparatively higher than the high achievement group.
There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of low achievement Boys group and low achievement Girls group.

**Data:** $CR_{obs.} = 0.4526$ NS $CR_{tab} = 1.96$

$CR_{tab} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 83.2993$  
$M_2 = 83.9109$

**Finding:** The null hypothesis was accepted.

**Conclusion:**

(1) The research hypothesis was rejected.

(2) The difference is not significant.

(3) There is no comparative difference in attitude between low achievement Boys group and low achievement Girls group.

$H_{16} :$ There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high achievement Boys group and high achievement Girls group.

**Data:** $CR_{obs.} = 0.1420$ NS $CR_{tab} = 1.96$

$CR_{tab} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 81.7315$  
$M_2 = 81.8772$

**Finding:** The null hypothesis was not rejected.
Conclusion: There is no significant difference hence there is no comparative difference in attitude between high achievement Boys group and high achievement Girls group.

$H_{17}$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high achievement Boys group and low achievement Boys group.

Data: $CR_{obs} = 1.2741$ NS $CR_{tab} = 1.96$

$CR_{tab} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 81.7315$ $M_2 = 83.2993$

Finding: The null-hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: (1) There is no significant difference hence there is no comparative difference in attitude between high achievement Boys group and low achievement Boys group, therefore the research hypothesis was rejected which reads as there is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high achievement Boys group and low achievement Boys group.

$H_{18}$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of high achievement Girls group and low achievement Girls group.
Data: $CR_{obs.} = 1.7414$ NS $CR_{tab} = 1.96$

$CR_{tab} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 81.8772$ $M_2 = 83.9109$

**Finding:** The built up null-hypothesis was not rejected.

**Conclusion:**

1. The mean scores difference is not significant.
2. There is no comparative difference in attitude between high achievement Girls group and low achievement Girls group.

6.3.2.6: **Study-6: Significance of mean difference:**
Area (Urban and Rural) V/s Attitude:

$H_{19}$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of rural group and urban group.

Data: $CR_{obs.} = 1.6348$ NS $CR_{tab} = 1.96$

$CR_{tab} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 83.6808$ $M_2 = 82.6911$

**Finding:** The built up null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Conclusion:**

1. Hence the alternative hypothesis: there is significant difference between the mean scores,
on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of rural group and urban group — was rejected.

(2) The mean scores difference is not significant hence there is no comparative difference in attitude between rural group and urban group.

\( H_{20} : \) There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of Urban Boys group and Urban Girls group.

Data:  

\[
\text{CR}_{\text{obs}} = 0.9388 \quad \text{NS} \quad \text{CR}_{\text{tab}} = 1.96 \\
\text{CR}_{\text{tab}} = 2.58 \\
M_1 = 81.3115 \quad M_2 = 83.0939
\]

Finding: The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: The mean scores difference is not significant; hence there is no comparative difference in attitude between urban boys group and urban girls group.

\( H_{21} : \) There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of Rural Boys group and Rural Girls group.

Data:  

\[
\text{CR}_{\text{obs}} = 2.4441 \quad \text{CR}_{\text{tab}} = 1.96^* \\
M_1 = 85.0860 \quad M_2 = 82.9320
\]
Finding: The null hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the hypothesis now reads as: there is significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of Rural Boys group and Rural Girls group which means that the mean scores difference is significant and the attitude of Rural Boys group is comparatively higher than the Rural Girls group.

$H_{22}$: There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of Urban Boys group and Rural Boys group.

Data: $CR_{obs} = 3.1178$  \hspace{1cm} $CR_{tab}^{*} = 1.96$
\hspace{1cm} $CR_{tab}^{**} = 2.58$

$M_1 = 82.3115$  \hspace{1cm} $M_2 = 85.0860$

Finding: The built up null-hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusion: (1) Hence the hypothesis now reads as: there is significant difference between the mean scores on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of Rural Boys group and Rural Girls group which means that the mean scores difference is significant and the attitude of Rural Boys group is comparatively higher than the Rural Girls group.
H_{23} : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of urban girls group and rural girls group.

Data: \( CR_{obs.} = 0.1965 \) NS \( CR_{tab} = 1.96 \)

\[ CR_{tab} = 2.58 \]

\( M_1 = 83.0939 \)

\( M_2 = 82.9320 \)

Finding: The null-hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: The mean scores difference is not significant; hence there is no comparative difference in attitude between urban girls group and rural girls group.

H_{24} : There is no significant difference between the mean scores, on measurement of attitude towards national integration, of Boys group and Girls group.

Data: \( CR_{obs.} = 0.7283 \) NS \( CR_{tab} = 1.96 \)

\[ CR_{tab} = 2.58 \]

\( M_1 = 83.4686 \)

\( M_2 = 83.0307 \)

Finding: The null-hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusion: The mean scores difference is not significant hence there is no comparative difference in attitude between Boys group and Girls group.
6.4. **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:**

On the basis of the conclusions drawn from the six studies, a brief summary of the findings is given here:

1. On attitude scale the maximum possible score was 115 and minimum was zero. The scoring of whole group remained between 55 and 115. The scores of high attitude students ranged between 86 and 115, of average attitude students ranged between 77 and 85, and of low attitude students ranged between 55 and 76.

Out of 1000 students, 392 (i.e., 39.2%) students showed high, 363 (i.e., 36.3%) students showed average and 245 (i.e., 24.5%) showed low attitude.

2. There is no positive significant correlation between IQ and Attitude, SES and Attitude, and Achievement and Attitude. But there is almost negligible negative correlation between IQ and Attitude and negative correlation between SES and Attitude, Achievement and Attitude are observed.

It is revealed that with increase in SES and Achievement there is slight decrease in Attitude towards national integration.
3. The students possessing low IQ showed higher attitude than their counterparts. Within the low IQ group boy students have higher attitude than Girls students; in addition to this, low IQ Boys students showed higher attitude than high IQ Boys students.

High IQ Boys and Girls students possess same level of attitude and also high IQ Girl students and low IQ Girl students possess same level of attitude.

4. The low SES and high SES students possess same level of attitude. But low SES Boys students have higher attitude than low SES Girl students. Within the Girl group, high SES Girl students showed higher attitude than low SES Girl students.

High SES Boys students and high SES Girl students as well as high SES Boys students and low SES Boy students possess same level of attitude.

5. The students who have academically low achievement possess higher attitude than their counterpart. Even though there is no significant difference in attitude between low achievement Boy students and low achievement Girl students, between high achievement Boy students and high achievement Girl students, between high achievement Boys students and low achievement Boy students, between high achievement Girl students and low achievement Girl students.
6. The Rural Boy students showed higher attitude than Rural Girl students and Urban Boy students.
On the other hand there is no significant difference in attitude between Rural group and Urban group, between Urban Boy students and Urban Girl students, between Urban Girl students and Rural Girl students, between Boy students and Girl students.

7. Standardization of Raw scores into T-scores showed characteristics of normal probability curve; and raw scores are also transferred into stanine norms and letter grade norm which shows that the attitude scale in national integration field is considered to be a standardized tool for the research purposes.

6.5. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS:
The availability of researches in the area of national integration is comparatively very low.

Similarly, regarding the teaching of national integration one can find a lack of awareness on the past of educational institutions in general and teachers in particular. The nation at large is obviously divided into many factors of disintegration like language, religion, provincialism etc. Parents are not much interested in the cultivation of attitudes of their children towards national
integration. In such a sceneries the research in this area has a significant value, and therefore it has considerable implications in Education:

- The programme for the national integration should be prepared on the basis of research to encourage the students to understand the need of change not only in outlook but also in attitude.

- Schedule should organise activities programme regarding national integration.

- The time prepared of fact for editions must take into consideration this point of national integration as a part of curriculum.

- Students should make awareness of Red cross, UNO, Rotary Club, Lions Club etc.

- Emphasis should be given to scientific and Democratic approaches.

- Tours should be organised not only to visit geographical and industrial places but also for cultural study.

6.6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH:

India being a developing democratic country, is lagging far behind as compared to the advanced countries like England and America in almost all the scientific and technical fields. It is equally true in the field of educational research and more so in the field of national integration.
A researcher who gets involved in the problem faces many issues which seek answers. In fact, in a research the thinking process generates more questions than are answered by the research. Some such issues are noted here for further research:

(1) A study of attitude towards national integration of SSC students.

(2) A study of attitude towards national integration of higher secondary science stream, students.

(3) Investigation into the impact of the programme for development or undevelopment on the lives of those who have undergone it.

(4) A critical study of role played by principals and teachers in the development of attitude towards national integration.

(5) A study of attitude towards national integration of college students.


(7) A comparative study of the attitude towards national integration of present Basic Secondary students and common school students.
(8) A comparative study of the attitude towards national integration of State Government school students and Central Government school students.

(9) An investigation into the effectiveness of different media on the attitude, of higher secondary students, towards national integration.