



## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PROBLEMS PERTAINING TO DIET AND OTHER TTI STUDENTS OF KARNATAKA STATE

Shivaprakash K. M.

Assistant Professor , T.M.A.E'S College of Education, Gangavathi.

### ABSTRACT

If we look into the academic achievement of the more TTI students, the DIET students have shown best results than other TTI students. Similarly the government TTI students have shown greater achievement than aided and un-aided TTI students. The un-aided TTI students have shown poor results. The investigator came to know such facts through the concern DIETs and TTIs and planned to know the causes for such excellent results in the DIET and causes for the poor results in the un-aided TTIs.

**KEY WORD:** *academic achievement , socio-education and economic status, attitude, adjustment.*

### INTRODUCTION:

Investigator came to know that many factors like socio-education and economic status, attitude, adjustment, personality factors, interest, aptitude are responsible for this. Academic achievement in the previous stage etc. is mainly contributing towards the academic attainment of the students studying in D.Ed., course. Hence, the investigator planned to collect the information regarding some of the above factors like, attitude, adjustment of the DIET students as well as the other type of TTI students and then wanted to compare the above factors to know the main causes for academic achievement of the students belonging to DIET and to those of other TTI students through their attitude and adjustment.

### 1. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.

1. To study the attitude of the DIET and other types TTI students towards infrastructure, physical facilities and various essential facilities provided in their respective institutions.
2. To study the adjustment of the DIET and other types TTI students towards infrastructure, physical facilities and various essential facilities provided in their respective institutions.
3. To study the relationship between adjustment and attitude of DIET students to that of other types of TTI students.

### 2. HYPOTHESES:

1.  $H_01$ : There is no significant difference between the D.Ed. students belonging to DIET and other TTI differ in their views with regards to attitude towards infrastructure, other physical facilities, library, laboratory facilities, principal, staff, teaching aids and other facilities.
2.  $H_02$ : There is no significant difference between the D.Ed. students belonging to DIET and other TTI differ in their views with regards to adjustment towards infrastructure, other physical facilities, library, laboratory facilities, principal and staff, teaching aids and other facilities.



### 3. THE VARIABLES INVOLVED IN THE STUDY.

- 1) Attitude
- 2) Adjustment
- 3) Infrastructure

### 4. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- 1) The present study is limited to primary teacher education level.
- 2) The present study is also limited to comparison of different types of TTIs of Karnataka State.
- 3) The present study is also limited to few variables like SEES, Attitude, Adjustment and Academic Achievement of the different types of TTIs in Karnataka state.
- 4) The present study is limited to different types of TTIs including DIETs established before 2004.

### 5. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE:

1) **Jehan, Anwer. (1988)**, studied on the problems experienced by secondary school teachers under different managements in Andhra Pradesh and their impact on performance of students. The result shows 1) between rural male and rural female students the difference was significant in factor A, aesthetic value, religious information and religious tranquility and (2) Urban male and female students differed significantly in  $Q_1$ , theoretical, religious and aesthetic values, orthodoxy and hostility.

2) **Jangira, N. K.,(1982)**. Studied on Social Cohesion in Elementary Teacher Training Institutions and Its Relationship with Their Efficiency The findings were (i) Social cohesion had significant correlation with the student teachers' achievement in theory as well as practice. (ii) Its correlations with the student-teachers' adjustment and attitudes were not significant. (iii) Social cohesion in the teacher training institutions turned out to be a predictor of student-teachers' achievement in practice teaching explaining 48.23 per cent of the variance. (iv) It was a comparatively weak predictor of student-teachers achievement in theory explaining merely 11.69 per cent of the variance in achievement.

3) **Chhaganlal and Mansukhabhai(1992)** studied the value, adjustment, attitude towards the teaching profession and academic achievement of teachers' children as compared to non-teachers' children. Stratified purposive sampling technique was followed in the study. In the sampling purpose first of all three districts of Saurashtra region were selected. Then four talukas were selected randomly from the three districts. It was decided to select high schools situated at districts and talukas. Only those schools were selected from which it was possible to get greater number of children of teachers teaching at different levels. Thus, twenty-four schools were selected. From these schools 591 teachers' children (266 boys and 325 girls) were selected. Correspondingly same number of non-teachers' children were taken from the same school, same grade and of the same sex. The tools used for measuring the dependent variables included Value Scale constructed by the researcher, Adjustment Inventory of K.G. Desai, Attitude Scale constructed by the researcher, and result sheets of annual examination of schools for obtaining the measures of academic achievement. Among other things, the study revealed that : (i) Non-teachers' children were significantly better than teachers' children in social value, whereas, teachers' children and non-teachers' children were found equal in power value, religious value, aesthetic value, theoretical value and economic value; (ii) Primary teachers' children were at a higher level than college teachers' children in theoretical and social values; (iii) Teachers' children were better adjusted than non-teachers' children; (iv) Primary, secondary and college teachers' children did not differ significantly in adjustment. (v) Teachers' children and non-teachers' children did not differ significantly in their attitude toward teaching profession.

4) **Chandrasekhar (2000)** conducted a study of primary school teachers education programme in Andhra Pradesh found that – sex, qualification, age. Experience, designation of teacher educator has not significantly influenced either the perception or their attitude towards the DIET's training programme. Further he found that only sex is significant but age and qualification of student teacher is not significant towards teaching profession.

## 6. DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

### a. Sample and Sampling Procedure.

The present study is a comparative study of attitude, adjustment, Socio-Economic Status and Academic Achievement of DIET students to that of other TTIs of Karnataka State. 400 DIET students and 400 TTIs students were taken as sample by simple random sampling technique.

### b. Tools Used for the Study:

- i) General Data Sheet for DIET / TTI's Students.
- ii) Attitude Scale for DIET/TTIs Students.
- iii) Adjustment Inventory for DIET/TTIs Students.

### c. Statistical Techniques Used for the Study

- 1) Mean and Standard Deviation
- 2) 't' Test

## 7. DATA ANALYSIS :

To know the significant difference between pairs of students of DIET, Government TTIs, Aided TTIs and unaided TTIs with respect to attitude towards infrastructure dimensions by applying the students t-test. The results so obtained are presented in the following table.

**Table-1**

**Results of t-test between pairs of students of DIET, Government TTIs', Aided TTIs' and unaided TTIs' with respect to attitude and its dimensions**

Variable	Group	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Signi.
Attitude scores	DIET	116.6500	8.2416	8.9953	<0.05	S
	Government	94.6000	7.2286			
	DIET	116.6500	8.2416	5.8958	<0.05	S
	Aided	103.8500	5.1327			
	DIET	116.6500	8.2416	15.2791	<0.05	S
	Unaided	85.0000	4.2302			
	Government	94.6000	7.2286	-4.6661	<0.05	S
	Aided	103.8500	5.1327			
	Government	94.6000	7.2286	5.1260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	85.0000	4.2302			
	Aided	103.8500	5.1327	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	85.0000	4.2302			
D. Ed course and teaching profession	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	9.0179	<0.05	S
	Government	9.4600	0.7229			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	5.9266	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	15.2843	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	-4.6461	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	5.1200	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			

Infrastructure, Physical, and material facilities	DIET	23.4500	1.7828	8.8261	<0.05	S
	Government	18.9200	1.4457			
	DIET	23.4500	1.7828	5.8259	<0.05	S
	Aided	20.7700	1.0265			
	DIET	23.4500	1.7828	14.6172	<0.05	S
	Unaided	17.0000	0.8460			
	Government	18.9200	1.4457	-4.6061	<0.05	S
	Aided	20.7700	1.0265			
	Government	18.9200	1.4457	5.1160	<0.05	S
	Unaided	17.0000	0.8460			
Attitude Principal towards	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	9.0179	<0.05	S
	Government	9.4600	0.7229			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	5.9266	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	15.2843	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	-4.6111	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	5.1560	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
Attitude towards Staff	DIET	11.6250	0.8366	8.7572	<0.05	S
	Government	9.4600	0.7229			
	DIET	11.6250	0.8366	5.6501	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	DIET	11.6250	0.8366	14.9079	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	-4.6551	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	5.1300	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
Curricular & co-curriculum	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	9.0179	<0.05	S
	Government	9.4600	0.7229			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	5.9266	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	15.2843	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	-4.6701	<0.05	S
Aided	10.3850	0.5133				

	Government	9.4600	0.7229	5.1260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
Classroom teaching & Guidance	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	9.0179	<0.05	S
	Government	9.4600	0.7229			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	5.9266	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	15.2843	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	-4.7861	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	5.1260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
Practicing schools	DIET	15.5000	1.0781	8.9270	<0.05	S
	Government	12.6133	0.9638			
	DIET	15.5000	1.0781	5.7901	<0.05	S
	Aided	13.8467	0.6844			
	DIET	15.5000	1.0781	15.3146	<0.05	S
	Unaided	11.3333	0.5640			
	Government	12.6133	0.9638	-4.7661	<0.05	S
	Aided	13.8467	0.6844			
	Government	12.6133	0.9638	5.1260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	11.3333	0.5640			
	Aided	13.8467	0.6844	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	11.3333	0.5640			
Evaluation and internal assessment	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	9.0179	<0.05	S
	Government	9.4600	0.7229			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	5.9266	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	DIET	11.6750	0.8271	15.2843	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	-4.4461	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133			
	Government	9.4600	0.7229	5.1260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
	Aided	10.3850	0.5133	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	8.5000	0.4230			
Personal, friends and others	DIET	7.7000	0.5366	8.6395	<0.05	S
	Government	6.3067	0.4819			
	DIET	7.7000	0.5366	5.4576	<0.05	S
	Aided	6.9233	0.3422			

	DIET	7.7000	0.5366	15.0004	<0.05	S
	Unaided	5.6667	0.2820			
	Government	6.3067	0.4819	-4.6761	<0.05	S
	Aided	6.9233	0.3422			
	Government	6.3067	0.4819	5.1260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	5.6667	0.2820			
	Aided	6.9233	0.3422	12.6742	<0.05	S
	Unaided	5.6667	0.2820			

From the above table results, we clearly seen that,

The Students belonging to DIET & Government TTIs', DIET & aided TTIs', DIET & unaided TTIs', Government TTIs' & aided TTIs', Government TTIs' & unaided TTIs' and aided TTIs' & unaided TTIs' differ significantly with respect to attitude towards infrastructure, physical facilities and various essential facilities provided in their respective institutions at 0.05% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis  $H_0$ 1 is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that DIET students have higher attitudes compared to Government TTIs', aided TTIs' and Unaided TTIs' students.

**Table-2: Results of t-test between pairs of students of DIET, Government TTIs', Aided TTIs' and unaided TTIs' with respect to adjustment inventory and its dimensions.**

Variable	Group	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Sign.
Adjustment inventory	DIET	122.4000	9.2418	8.0232	<0.05	S
	Government	103.6500	4.8804			
	DIET	122.4000	9.2418	7.6218	<0.05	S
	Aided	104.3000	5.2325			
	DIET	122.4000	9.2418	20.5821	<0.05	S
	Unaided	74.7000	4.6915			
	Government	103.6500	4.8804	-0.4063	>0.05	NS
	Aided	104.3000	5.2325			
	Government	103.6500	4.8804	19.1247	<0.05	S
	Unaided	74.7000	4.6915			
	Aided	104.3000	5.2325	18.8260	<0.05	S
	Unaided	74.7000	4.6915			
D. Ed course and teaching profession	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	8.0232	<0.05	S
	Government	10.3650	0.4880			
	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	7.6622	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	19.9999	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	-0.4163	>0.05	NS
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	19.1147	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232	18.8360	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
Infrastructure, Physical, and material facilities	DIET	24.4800	1.8484	8.0443	<0.05	S

	Government	20.7300	0.9761			
	DIET	24.4800	1.8484	7.5918	<0.05	S
	Aided	20.8600	1.0465			
	DIET	24.4800	1.8484	20.6021	<0.05	S
	Unaided	14.9400	0.9383			
	Government	20.7300	0.9761	-0.4059	>0.05	NS
	Aided	20.8600	1.0465			
	Government	20.7300	0.9761	19.2225	<0.05	S
	Unaided	14.9400	0.9383			
	Aided	20.8600	1.0465	18.7789	<0.05	S
	Unaided	14.9400	0.9383			
Principal	DIET	12.4400	1.4050	6.2390	<0.05	S
	Government	10.3650	0.4880			
	DIET	12.4400	1.4050	5.9955	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	DIET	12.4400	1.4050	15.0049	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	-0.3996	>0.05	NS
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	19.0247	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
Staff	DIET	12.4400	1.4050	6.2390	<0.05	S
	Government	10.3650	0.4880			
	DIET	12.4400	1.4050	5.9955	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	DIET	12.4400	1.4050	15.0049	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	-0.4059	>0.05	NS
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	19.0925	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
Curricular & co-curriculum	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	8.0193	<0.05	S
	Government	10.3650	0.4880			
	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	7.6192	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	20.5792	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	-0.3891	>0.05	NS
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	18.8989	<0.05	S

	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232	18.8960	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
Classroom teaching & Guidance	DIET	12.0900	1.0316	6.7601	<0.05	S
	Government	10.3650	0.4880			
	DIET	12.0900	1.0316	6.4182	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	DIET	12.0900	1.0316	18.2322	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	-0.4063	>0.05	NS
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	19.1667	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232	18.7960	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
Practicing schools	DIET	16.1033	1.4125	6.5661	<0.05	S
	Government	13.8200	0.6507			
	DIET	16.1033	1.4125	6.2358	<0.05	S
	Aided	13.9067	0.6977			
	DIET	16.1033	1.4125	17.7848	<0.05	S
	Unaided	9.9600	0.6255			
	Government	13.8200	0.6507	-0.3891	>0.05	NS
	Aided	13.9067	0.6977			
	Government	13.8200	0.6507	19.1347	<0.05	S
	Unaided	9.9600	0.6255			
	Aided	13.9067	0.6977	18.8060	<0.05	S
	Unaided	9.9600	0.6255			
Evaluation and internal assessment	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	7.9902	<0.05	S
	Government	10.3650	0.4880			
	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	7.5782	<0.05	S
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	DIET	12.2400	0.9242	20.5921	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	-0.4763	>0.05	NS
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232			
	Government	10.3650	0.4880	19.0925	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
	Aided	10.4300	0.5232	18.8270	<0.05	S
	Unaided	7.4700	0.4692			
Personal, friends and others	DIET	8.1267	0.6052	7.9187	<0.05	S
	Government	6.9100	0.3254			
	DIET	8.1267	0.6052	7.5119	<0.05	S
	Aided	6.9533	0.3488			
	DIET	8.1267	0.6052	20.6568	<0.05	S



	Unaided	4.9800	0.3128			
	Government	6.9100	0.3254	-0.4056	>0.05	NS
	Aided	6.9533	0.3488			
	Government	6.9100	0.3254	19.1147	<0.05	S
	Unaided	4.9800	0.3128			
	Aided	6.9533	0.3488	18.8460	<0.05	S
	Unaided	4.9800	0.3128			

From the above table results, we clearly seen that,

The Students belonging to DIET & Government TTIs, DIET & aided TTIs, DIET & unaided TTIs, Government TTIs & unaided TTIs and aided TTIs & unaided TTIs' differ significantly with respect to adjustment inventory in all dimensions of infrastructure at 0.05% level of significance. Hence, the null hypotheses  $H_02$  is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that DIET students have higher adjustment inventory compared to Government TTIs, aided TTIs and Unaided TTIs students.

### 8. FINDINGS:

- 1) There is significant difference between the D.Ed. students belonging to DIET and other TTI differ in their views with regards to attitude towards infrastructure, other physical facilities, library, laboratory facilities, principal, staff, teaching aids and other facilities.
- 2) There is significant difference between the D.Ed. students belonging to DIET and other TTI differ in their views with regards to adjustment towards infrastructure, other physical facilities, library, laboratory facilities, principal and staff, teaching aids and other facilities.

### 9. CONCLUSION:

All the D.Ed. students belonging to DIET and other TTI differ in their views with regards to positive attitude towards infrastructure and other facilities. There for every teacher education institution must have appropriate infrastructure. And one important aspect is that all the D.Ed. students belonging to DIET and other TTI differ in their views with regards to adjustment towards infrastructure and other facilities.

### REFERENCES:

1. Srivasthava, Shoba (1986) "A study of job satisfaction and professional honesty of primary school teachers with necessary suggestions."
2. Singh. N. (1985) "A comparative study of teachers trained through integrated and traditional methods in terms of attitude towards teaching competence and role performance."
3. Prasad P. (1985) study on "Aspiration, Adjustment and Role conflict in primary and secondary school teachers"
4. Patil G.G. (1986) "A differential study of intelligence, interest and attitude of B.Ed. college students as contributory factors towards their achievements in the compulsory subjects."