

## **C H A P T E R   I V**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

**Result and Interpretation**

**Interpretation of the statistical analysis of "t"  
test**

**Classification of Teacher Adjustment scores into  
Categories**

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

#### Result and Interpretation

Problem of the research was formulated and defined (Chapter I). A critical review relevant to the problem and those even distinctly related was provided in Chapter II, Chapter III laid down the plan and procedure of the research, describe the sample and mechanism of its selection, tools, scoring procedure, statistical analysis done. Therefore, this chapter leads to the obtained results using the methodology adopted.

For the sake of convenience and obtaining systematic conclusion the results have been presented factor wise or area wise.

Table 4.1, shows the mean, S.D. and 't' comparison of trained teachers and untrained teachers for total adjustment and five areas or factors of adjustment. Table 4.2 shows the mean S.D. and categories of adjustment capacity of trained male teachers and trained female teachers and untrained male and untrained female teachers on five areas or factors of adjustment.

Interpretation of the Statistical Analysis of 't' test.

Table 4.1 Shows the Means, S.Ds. and 't' comparison of Trained Teachers and Untrained Teachers for Total Adjustment Capacity and Five area of Adjustment :

Sr.No.	Set of Comparison	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	Df (N <sub>1</sub> +N <sub>2</sub> -2)	't'	Significance
1.	Trained Teachers with untrained Teachers	1.Trained Teachers 2.Untrained Teachers	64 40	436.44 426.12	48.09 57.22	102	0.95	N.S.
2.	Trained Male Tr. with Trained Female Tr.	1.Trained Male Tr. 2.Trained Female Tr.	16 48	434.25 437.17	45.60 40.88	062	0.227	N.S.
3.	Untrained Male Tr.with Untrained Female Tr.	1.Untrained Male Tr. 2.Untrained Female Tr.	05 35	457.00 421.71	25.31 59.12	038	2.397	*
4.	Trained Male Tr. with Untrained Male Tr.	1.Trained Male Tr. 2.Untrained Male Tr.	16 05	434.25 457.00	45.60 25.31	019	-1.416	N.S.
5.	Trained Female Tr.with Untrained Female Tr.	1.Trained Female Tr. 2.Untrained Female Tr.	48 35	437.17 421.71	40.88 59.12	081	1.337	N.S.
6.	Trained Tr.with Untrained Tr.in adjustment of academic & general Environment of instu.	1.Trained Tr. 2.Untrained Teacher	64 40	088.86 086.34	14.47 11.69	102	0.974	N.S.
7.	Trained Tr.with Untrained Tr.in Socio-Psycho-physical adjustment	1.Trained Teacher 2.Untrained Teacher	64 40	116.19 111.00	14.48 22.09	102	1.320	N.S.
8.	Trained Tr.with Untrained Tr.in professional relationship adjustment	1.Trained Teacher 2.Untrained Teacher	64 40	076.65 078.23	11.23 11.54	102	-0.686	N.S.
9.	Trained Tr.with Untrained Tr.in personal life adjustment	1.Trained Teacher 2.Untrained Teacher	64 40	105.06 105.12	14.80 18.85	102	-.00017	N.S.
10.	Trained Tr.with Untrained Tr.in financial adjustment & job satisfaction	1.Trained Teacher 2.Untrained Teacher	64 40	049.62 045.25	10.67 11.25	102	1.925	N.S.

\* = Indicates significance at .05 level, \*\* = Indicates significance at .01 level, N.S.= Indicates not significant.

Table 4.1 shows the data collected for 10 objectives stated in Chapter I. (2 to 11).

1) Objective No.2 states :

"To compare the adjustment capacity of trained teachers with untrained teachers".

The obtained values for the trained and untrained teachers are:

MT = 436.44	S1 = 48.09	N1 = 64
M2 = 426.12	S2 = 57.22	N2 = 40

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df (N1 + N2 - 2) is 102.

The obtained 't' value 0.95 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.98 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.1 that "There is no significant difference in adjustment capacity of trained teachers with untrained teachers" stands.

2) Objective No.3 states :

"To compare the adjustment capacity of trained male teachers with trained female teachers".

The obtained values for trained male teachers and trained female teachers are:

M1 = 434.25	S1 = 45.60	N1 = 16
M2 = 437.17	S2 = 40.88	N2 = 48

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df (N1 + N2 - 2) is 62. The obtained 't' value 0.227 is less than the tabled 't' value 2.00 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.2 that, "There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of the trained male teachers with trained female teachers" stands.

3) Objective No.4 states :

"To compare the adjustment capacity of untrained male teachers with untrained female teachers".

The obtained values for the untrained male teachers with untrained female teachers are :

M1 = 457.0	S1 = 25.31	N1 = 5
M2 = 421.71	S2 = 59.12	N2 = 35

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df (N1 + N2 - 2) is 38. The obtained 't' value 2.397 is

greater than the tabled 't' value 2.03 at 0.05 level but the obtained 't' value is less than the tabled 't' value at 0.01 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly at 0.01 level with respect to the variable under consideration but at 0.05 level the two groups differ significantly. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.3 that "There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of untrained male teachers with untrained female teachers" stands at 0.01 level but rejected at 0.05 level.

4) Objective No.5 states :

"To compare the adjustment capacity of trained male teachers with untrained male teachers".

The obtained values for the trained male teachers and untrained male teachers are:

M1 = 434.25	S1 = 45.60	N1 = 16
M2 = 457.00	S2 = 25.31	N2 = 5

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df  $(N1 + N2 - 2)$  19. The obtained 't' value -1.416 is less than the tabled 't' value 2.09 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.4 that "There is no

significant difference in the adjustment capacity of trained male teachers with untrained male teachers" stands.

5) Objective No.6 states :

"To compare the adjustment capacity of trained female teachers with untrained female teachers".

The obtained values for trained female teachers and untrained female teachers are:

M1 = 437.17	S1 = 40.88	N1 = 48
M2 = 421.71	S2 = 59.12	N2 = 35

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df  $(N1 + N2 - 2)$  81. The obtained 't' value 1.337 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.99 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.5 that, "There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of trained female teachers with untrained female teachers" is accepted.

6) Objective No.7 states :

"To compare the adjustment with the academic and general environment of the institution of trained teachers with untrained teachers".

The obtained values for trained teachers and

untrained teachers of adjustment with the academic and general environment of the institution are:

M1 = 88.86	S1 = 14.47	N1 = 64
M2 = 86.34	S2 = 11.69	N2 = 40

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df (N1 + N2 - 2) is 102. The obtained 't' value 0.974 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.98 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.6 that, "There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of academic and general environment of institution of trained teachers with untrained teachers" stands.

7) Objective No.8 states :

"To compare socio-psycho-physical adjustment of the trained teachers with untrained teachers".

To obtained values for trained teachers and untrained teachers on their socio-psycho-physical adjustment are :

M1 = 116.19	S1 = 14.48	N1 = 64
M2 = 111.00	S2 = 22.09	N2 = 40

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df

( $N_1 + N_2 - 2$ ) is 102. The obtained 't' value -0.686 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.98 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No. 7 that, "There is no significant difference in the professional adjustment of the trained teachers with untrained teachers" stands.

8) Objective No. 9 states :

"To compare the professional relationship adjustment of trained teachers with untrained teachers."

The obtained values for trained teachers and untrained teachers on their professional relationship adjustment are :

$M_1 = 76.65$	$S_1 = 11.23$	$N_1 = 64$
$M_2 = 78.23$	$S_2 = 11.54$	$N_2 = 40$

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df ( $N_1+N_2-2$ ) is 102. The obtained 't' value -0.686 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.98 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No. 8 that,

"There is no significant difference in the professional adjustment of the trained teachers with untrained teachers." is accepted.

9) Objectives No. 10 states :

"To compare the personal life adjustment of trained teachers with untrained teachers".

The obtained values for trained teachers and untrained teachers on their personal life adjustment are :

M1 = 105.06	S1 = 14.80	N1 = 64
M2 = 105.12	S2 = 18.85	N2 = 40

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with  $df$  ( $N1 + N2 - 2$ ) is 102. The obtained 't' value -0.00017 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.98 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No. 9 that, "There is no significant difference in the personal life adjustment of the trained teachers with untrained teachers" stands.

10) Objective No.11 states :

"To compare the financial adjustment and job satisfaction of trained teachers with untrained teachers".

The obtained values for trained teachers and untrained teachers on their financial adjustment and job satisfaction are :

M1 = 49.62                      S1 = 10.67                      N1 = 64

M2 = 45.25                      S2 = 11.25                      N2 = 40

respectively.

The appropriate 't' test for this situation is used with df (N1 + N2 - 2) is 102. The obtained 't' value 1.925 is less than the tabled 't' value 1.98 at 0.05 level. It is therefore concluded that the two groups do not differ significantly with respect to the variable under consideration. Therefore the Null Hypothesis No.10 that, "There is no significant difference in the financial adjustment and job satisfaction of the trained teachers with untrained teachers" is accepted.

The following findings are from the above 't' value interpretation :

i) There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of trained teachers with untrained teachers.

ii) There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of trained male teachers with trained female teachers.

iii) There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of untrained male teachers with untrained female teachers at 0.01 level but at 0.05 level the 't' value is greater than the tabled 't' value so that at 0.05 level there is significant difference in the adjustment capacity of untrained male teachers with untrained female teachers.

iv) There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of trained male teachers with untrained male teachers.

v) There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of trained female teachers with untrained female teachers.

vi) There is no significant difference in the adjustment capacity of academic and general environment of institution of trained teachers with untrained teachers.

vii) There is no significant difference in socio-psycho-physical adjustment of trained teachers with untrained teachers.

viii) There is no significant difference in the professional relationship adjustment of trained teachers with untrained teachers.

ix) There is no significant difference in the personal life adjustment of trained teachers with untrained teachers.

x) There is no significant difference in the financial adjustment and jobsatisfaction of trained teachers with untrained teachers.

TABLE 4.2

Table 4.2 Shows Mean, S.D. & Categories of Adjustment of Trained and Untrained Teachers of both Sexes on five Areas/Factors of Adjustment.

Sr. No.	Areas or Factors of Adjustment	Sex	Trained Teachers			Untrained Teachers				
			N	Mean	S.D.	Categories	N	Mean	S.D.	Categories
I	Adjustment with academic & general Environment of Institution	Male	16	91.56	11.14	B	5	97.6	9.24	B
		Female	48	87.96	15.27	C	35	84.74	12.46	C
		M + F	64	88.86	14.47	C	40	86.34	11.69	C
II	Socio-psycho physical Adjustment	Male	16	121.19	14.46	C	5	130.6	10.42	C
		Female	48	114.53	14.11	C	35	108.2	21.90	C
		M + F	64	116.19	14.48	C	40	111.00	22.09	C
III	Professional Relationship Adjustment	Male	16	69.81	12.55	C	5	75.60	8.5	C
		Female	48	78.93	9.75	C	35	78.69	11.85	C
		M + F	64	76.65	11.23	C	40	78.23	11.54	C
IV	Personal life Adjustment	Male	16	109.44	10.23	C	5	106.2	15.21	C
		Female	48	103.60	15.78	C	35	104.97	91.31	C
		M + F	64	105.06	14.80	C	40	105.12	18.85	C
V	Financial Adjustment and Job satisfaction	Male	16	42.25	8.29	C	5	47.00	7.75	C
		Female	48	52.10	10.24	C	35	45.11	11.95	D
		M + F	64	49.62	10.67	C	40	45.34	11.25	C
VI	Total Adjustment	Male	16	434.25	45.60	C	5	457.00	25.31	C
		Female	48	437.17	40.88	C	35	421.71	59.12	C
		M + F	64	436.44	48.09	C	40	426.12	57.22	C

### **Classification of Teachers Adjustment Scores into Categories:**

The classification of the adjustment in terms of categories had been done the help of manual for the Teacher Adjustment Inventory (See Appendix-]for the Inventory along with Scoring Key and Manual).

Table 4.2 shows data collected for the analysis of total adjustment categories of trained male teachers and trained female teachers and untrained male teachers and untrained female teachers.

i) The obtained categories 'B' for trained and untrained male teachers in Adjustment of the Academic and General Environment of the Institution shows a good and satisfactory adjustment in that area. Whereas, the other groups show quite satisfactory or average ('C' category) adjustment.

ii) Table 4.2 shows untrained female teachers are ('D' category) poor in financial adjustment and job satisfaction. Whereas, in the trained female teachers score shows average adjustment. It can be said that untrained female teachers faced financial problems and get little job satisfaction than their counterpart.

iii) All the four groups trained male teachers, untrained male teachers and trained female teachers and untrained female teachers have average adjustment categories in the rest of areas or factors of adjustment.