

*Analysis and Interpretation*

---

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

With the economy constantly changing there is a need for educational institutions to evolve and adapt itself to such changes. Educational institutions and industry need to work together to understand the need of the hour and help the students achieve the required skills. Traditionally the role of teachers was only to impart subject knowledge but now there is a whole new dimension with emphases on research and publication. There is also an increase in the administrative duties with colleges gaining autonomy and NAAC accreditation.

#### **Section A: Socio-economic and Job-related Profile of the Target Faculty**

Percentage analyses and descriptive statistics were used to analyse the data. Interpretation for each table is given below the table.

#### **Section B: The Expected Competencies for the Faculty**

Kendall's Co-Efficient of Concordance (W) was used to find out the expected competencies of faculty and the similarity among the rankings given by faculty respondents and HOD respondents. Interpretation for each table is given below the table.

#### **Section C: Analysis of the Five Competency Scores by Socio-economic and Job-related Profile**

ANOVA and t-test were used to find the difference between group means of independent variables and the five competencies, namely, Knowledge, skill, motive, traits and self-concept.

### **SECTION A - SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS**

The variables namely age (in years), gender, marital status, type of family, monthly income (personal), total family income, residential area and medium of school education are shown in the table 4.1 and the interpretation of the same has been presented below.

**Table 4.1 - Personal Profile of the Respondents**

Socio Economic Profile		Number of Respondents	Percentage
Age (in Years)	Up to 30 years	93	27.2
	31-35 years	108	31.6
	36-40 years	80	23.4
	41-45 years	40	11.7
	Above 46 years	21	6.1
Gender	Male	72	21.1
	Female	270	78.9
Marital Status	Married	291	85.1
	Unmarried	51	14.9
Type of family	Joint family	127	37.1
	Nuclear	215	62.9
Monthly income (personal)	Up to 20000	136	39.8
	20001-30000	115	33.6
	30001-40000	37	10.8
	Above 40000	54	15.8
Total family income	Up to 40000	100	29.2
	40001-60000	103	30.1
	60001-80000	54	15.8
	Above 80000	85	24.9
Residential area	Rural	65	19.0
	Urban	224	65.5
	Semi – Urban	53	15.5
School Education (Medium)	English	281	82.2
	Vernacular	61	17.8
Total number of respondents 342			

**(Source:** Primary Data)

**Age:** It is noted from the above table that 58.84 per cent are less than 35 years. 23.4 per cent are between the age group of 35 to 40 years.

The average age of the faculty is 35 years with a S.D of 6.32 years. The minimum age of the respondent is 24 years and the maximum age of 57 years.

**Gender:** 78.9 per cent of the respondents are females and 21.1 per cent are male.

Nair (2016) reported similar findings in his study. There are a larger number on female faculty in Arts and Science Colleges of Coimbatore.

**Marital Status:** It is observed that 85.1% per cent are married and 14.9 per cent are unmarried.

The majority of the respondents are married and the result corresponds with the age of the respondents, majority of the faculty are between the age group of 31- 40 years.

**Type of Family:** 62.9 per cent of the respondents live in nuclear families while 37.1 per cent live in joint families.

**Monthly Income (Personal):** The personal monthly income of 39.8 per cent of the respondents are less than Rs.20,000 while 33.6 per cent of them earn in the range of Rs.20,000-Rs.30,000.

73.4 per cent of the respondents earn an income less than Rs.30,000 per month. The reason for the low level of remuneration maybe because most of the respondents were from self-financed colleges, where the management does not receive any government aid towards salaries.

**Total Family Income:** 29.2 percent of the faculty have a family income of up to Rs.40,000 and 30.1 per cent have a family income ranging between Rs.40,001 – Rs.60,000. 15.8 per cent is between Rs.60,001-Rs.80,000 and 24.9 per cent above Rs80,000.

It can be inferred that most of the families have a second earning member. It is consistent with the fact that 78.9 per cent of the respondents are females and that 85.1 per cent of the respondents are married.

**Residential Area:** 65.5 per cent of the respondents live in urban area and 35.5 per cent in rural area.

Most of the higher education institutions are in urban area thus the majority of the respondents reside in urban area, the faculty have taken advantage of proximity to workplace.

**The Medium of School Education:** 82.2 per cent of the respondents had studied in English medium school and only 17.8 per cent in vernacular.

In most of the colleges, the medium of instruction is in English.

### **JOB RELATED PROFILE OF THE FACULTY**

Table 4.2 relates to the Job Profile of the faculty. The profile relates to the educational qualification, additional qualification, type of the institution, designation, total years of teaching and industrial experience, number of registered scholars, teaching hours per week, non-academic duties and faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

**Table 4.2 - Job Related Profile of the Faculty**

<b>Job Related Profile</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Highest Educational Qualification	Post Graduate	35	10.2
	M.Phil.	180	52.6
	Ph.D.	127	37.1
Additional Qualification	None	240	70.2
	SLET	37	10.8
	NET	38	11.1
	Any other	27	7.9
Category of Employment	Aided college	44	12.9
	self-finance college	298	87.1
Designation	Assistant Professor	294	86.0
	Associate Professor	48	14.0

<b>Job Related Profile</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Teaching Experience	1-5 years	98	28.7
	6 - 10 years	140	40.9
	11 - 15 years	62	18.1
	16 & above	42	12.3
Industrial Experience	None	235	68.7
	1-2 years	54	15.8
	3-4 years	30	8.8
	5 & above	23	6.7
Number of registered research scholars	None	306	89.5
	1-2 scholars	15	4.4
	3-4 scholars	11	3.2
	5 & above	10	2.9
Number of teaching hours/week	10-15 hrs	25	7.3
	16 - 20 hrs	293	85.7
	21 hrs & above	24	7.0
Non-Academic coordinating duties	Sports	17	5.0
	Cultural	38	11.1
	Events	134	39.2
	Any other	153	44.7
Number of faculty development programs attended	1-2	55	16.1
	3-4	97	28.4
	5-6	78	22.8
	Above 7	112	32.7
Total number of respondents 342			

(Source: Primary Data)

**Highest Educational Qualification:** Of the total respondents 37.1 per cent had completed Ph.D., 52.6 per cent of them had M.Phil. and 10.2 per cent of the faculty had only a postgraduate qualification.

Majority of the faculty had M.Phil. qualifications as most of the respondents are from Self-financed colleges.

**Additional Qualification:** 10.8 per cent of the faculty are SLET qualified and 11.1 per cent had cleared the NET. 70.2 per cent did not have any additional qualifications while the remaining 7.9 per cent had additional qualifications like PGDCA, B.Ed., MBA etc.

Recently, UGC has made it mandatory for faculty to qualify NET/SLET exam.

**Category of Employment:** Of the total respondents 87.1 per cent were from self-financed colleges and 12.9 per cent of the faculty are from aided colleges.

When the primary data was collected, Coimbatore had 44 self-financing colleges and 8 aided institutions. Therefore the majority of the respondents were from self-financing colleges. (Source: Joint Director of College Education, Coimbatore-18)

**Designation:** 86 per cent of the faculty are assistant professors and 14 per cent are associate professors.

Most of the faculty are less than 40 years, so the majority of the respondents are Assistant Professors, similar result had been reported in the study made by Juliet Gladies and Vijila Kennedy (2013).

**Teaching Experience:** 28.7 per cent of the faculty had teaching experience in the range of 1 to 5 years. 40.9 per cent of the faculty had teaching experience of 6 to 10 years. 8.1 per cent was in the range of 11 to 15 years and 12.3 per cent had a teaching experience above 16 years.

The teaching experience of the faculty varied from 1 year to 30 years. Majority of the faculty have a teaching experience between 6 to 10 years as most of the faculty are less than 40 years.

**Industrial Experience:** 68.7 per cent of the faculty did not have any industrial experience. 15.8 per cent have had an industrial experience of less than 2 years. 8.8 per cent had industrial experience between 3 to 4 years and 6.7 per cent above 5 years.

The maximum industrial experience of the faculty was 18 years.

**Number of Registered Research Scholars:** Most of the faculty, that is 89.5 per cent of the target faculty had not registered any scholars for M.Phil./Ph.D. 4.4 per cent had less than 2 scholars. 3.2 per cent had 3 to 4 scholars and 2.9 per cent above 5 scholars.

The majority of the faculty were not guiding any students for M.Phil./Ph.D.

**Number of Teaching Hours Per Week:** The numbers of teaching hours for 85.7 per cent of the faculty were between 16 to 20 hours per week. Only 7 per cent had a higher workload of 21 hours and above and 7.3 per cent had less than 16 hours per week.

The average teaching hours were 18 hours with a S.D of (1.90). The minimum teaching hours was 10 hours and a maximum of 24 hours per week.

**Non-Academic Coordinating Duties:** 5 per cent of the faculty had sports activities coordination, while 11.1 per cent coordinated cultural activities and 39.2 coordinated department events. 44.7 per cent of the faculty were coordinating general college events.

**Number of Faculty Development Programs (FDP) attended:** Majority of the faculty that is 32.7 per cent of the faculty had attended more than 7 FDP programmes. 22.8 per cent of the faculty had attended 5 to 6 FDP's, 28.4 per cent 3 to 4 FDP's while 16.1 per cent less than 2 FDP's.



## SECTION B: THE EXPECTED COMPETENCIES FOR THE FACULTY

The respondents ranked the important competencies required for the faculty in Arts and Science College in the order of importance. The most important was ranked one and the least important given the ranking of 10.

**Table 4.3 - Competencies Ranked by Faculty**

Competencies	Mean Rank	Rank Order
Subject Knowledge	2.19	1
Teaching ability	2.77	2
Communication Skill	3.31	3
Flexibility	7.11	8
Time-management	5.81	5
Intellectual curiosity	5.97	6
Interpersonal relationship	6.60	7
Sincere and hardworking	5.63	4
Personal involvement in research/ Research skill	7.79	9
Awareness about industrial requirement	7.80	10

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance

Kendall's W	.459
-------------	------

The mean ranks were found out for each of the competencies as shown in the table 4.3. The table indicates that subject knowledge has been ranked as the most important competency by 48.8 per cent of the faculty. Teaching ability has been ranked second by 36 per cent of the faculty. Communication skill is ranked third by 25.1 per cent of the faculty. Personal involvement in research/research skill and awareness about industrial requirement had the least ranking.

The Kendall's W value is 0.459 which indicates that there is a moderate level of similarity in the ranking order of the competencies by the faculty respondents.

**Table 4.4 - Competencies Ranked by HOD**

Competencies	Mean Rank	Rank Order
Subject Knowledge	1.98	1
Teaching ability	2.83	2
Communication Skill	3.11	3
Flexibility	7.69	9
Time-management	5.81	5
Intellectual curiosity	6.47	6
Interpersonal relationship	6.50	7
Sincere and hardworking	5.12	4
Personal involvement in research/ Research skill	7.83	10
Awareness about industrial requirement	7.65	8

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance

Kendall's W	.513
-------------	------

The mean ranks were found out for each of the competencies as shown in the table 4.4. The table indicates that subject knowledge has been ranked as the most important competency by 49.1 per cent of the faculty. Teaching ability has been ranked second by 40.9 per cent of the faculty. Communication skill is ranked third by 27.3 per cent of the faculty. Personal involvement in research/research skill and flexibility had the least ranking.

The Kendall's W value is 0.513 which indicates that there is a moderate level of similarity in the ranking order of the competencies by the HOD respondents.

### **SECTION C: ANALYSIS OF THE FIVE COMPETENCY SCORES BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND JOB-RELATED PROFILE**

#### **KNOWLEDGE SCORE**

The knowledge score is total of the self-evaluation made by the faculty on 6 items on a 5 point rating scale. The ratings assigned were 5-excellent, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-fair, 1-poor for each of the items. Knowledge scores were found out by adding the

ratings given for the 6 items. This was further analysed by comparing it with the selected socio-economic profile and the job related profile parameters of the faculty. The mean Knowledge scores were found for each group of selected variables which are shown below in the table 4.5 and 4.6.

**Table 4.5 - Knowledge Scores by Personal Socio-Economic Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Value	Table Value	Sig
Age	Up to 30 years	23.83	3.35	93	1.079	2.504	2.398	*
	31-35 years	24.24	3.65	108				
	36-40 years	25.33	3.07	80				
	41-45 years	23.73	3.74	40				
	Above 46 years	24.14	3.54	21				
Gender	Male	24.71	3.77	72	1.079		1.967	Ns
	Female	24.21	3.39	270				
Monthly Income (personal)	Up to 20000	23.82	3.31	136	0.030	1.621	2.631	Ns
	20001-30000	24.62	3.57	115				
	30001-40000	24.43	3.54	37				
	Above-40000	24.83	3.58	54				
Residential Area	Rural	24.42	4.13	65	0.030	0.565	3.022	Ns
	Urban	24.40	3.26	224				
	Semi-Urban	23.85	3.50	53				
School Education	English	24.31	3.46	281	0.030		1.967	Ns
	Vernacular	24.33	3.55	61				
Educational Qualification	Postgraduate	23.20	3.57	35	0.030	4.138	3.022	*
	M.Phil.	24.11	3.59	180				
	Ph.D.	24.92	3.18	127				
Additional Qualification	None	24.39	3.62	240	0.030	2.083	2.631	Ns
	SLET	24.14	2.96	37				
	NET	23.37	2.82	38				
	Any Other	25.37	3.39	27				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns – Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level)

(Source : Primary Data)

The Knowledge scores were found out separately for the different groups in the Socio-Economic profile and the following null hypotheses was framed and tested.

**H<sub>0</sub>1:** There is no significant difference between the mean knowledge scores of the faculty and the socio-economic profile variables of age, gender, monthly income(personal), residential area, medium of school instruction, educational qualifications and additional qualification

**Age:** The highest knowledge mean score is in the age group of 36 to 40 years with a mean of 25.33 and the lowest knowledge score is in the age group of 41 to 45 years with a mean of 23.73. The ANOVA F-test was applied to test the level of significance. F-test value of 2.50 is higher than the table value of 2.39 at 5% level of significance.

Thus it can be inferred that the mean knowledge scores differ significantly between the age groups of the faculty.

**Gender:** The table shows that the mean knowledge score of male is 24.71 and the mean knowledge score for female is 24.21, which are similar. *t*-test was applied and the *t*-test value of 1.07 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the mean knowledge scores of male and female faculty.

**Monthly Income (Personal):** Lowest mean knowledge score of 23.82 is found among faculty with a personal income of less than Rs.20,000 and the remaining mean knowledge scores are similar. F-test value of 1.62 is lower than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the mean knowledge score and the monthly income (personal) of the faculty.

**Residential Area:** The mean knowledge scores are similar for the area of residence with lowest score of 23.85 for semi-urban residential area. F-test value of 0.56 is lower than the table value of 3.02 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the mean knowledge score and the residential area of the faculty.

**Medium of School Education:** The mean knowledge scores are similar for the medium of school education whether English or vernaculars like Tamil, Malayalam and others.

The mean score for school education in English medium is (24.31) and for Vernacular medium is (24.33). The t-test value of (0.03) is less than the table value of (1.96) at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the mean knowledge score and the medium of school education of the faculty.

**Highest Educational Qualification:** The highest mean knowledge score of (24.92) is for faculty with Ph.D. qualification and the lowest of (23.20) is for faculty with post-graduation. F-test value of (4.13) is higher than the table value of (3.02) at 5% level of significance.

Thus, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the mean knowledge scores and the educational qualification of the faculty.

**Additional Qualification:** The mean knowledge scores are similar for the faculty with NET/SLET qualification and that of the faculty without any additional qualification. Faculty with other additional qualification like B.Ed., MBA etc. have a higher mean score of (25.37). F-test value of (2.08) is lower than the table value of (2.63) at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the mean knowledge score and the additional qualification of the faculty

## **RESULT**

ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between mean knowledge scores and the socio-economic variables namely age and the educational qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean knowledge scores and the socio-economic variables namely monthly income (personal), residential area and additional qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between mean knowledge scores and the socio-economic variables namely gender and medium of school instruction. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4.6 - Knowledge Scores by Job-Related Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Table Value	Sig
Category of Employment	Aided college	25.59	2.86	44	2.631		2.590	**
	Self-financed college	24.13	3.52	298				
Designation	Assistant Professor	24.31	3.47	294	0.127		1.967	Ns
	Associate Professor	24.38	3.56	46				
Teaching Experience	1 - 5 years	24.35	3.21	98		0.519	2.631	Ns
	6 - 10 years	24.27	3.62	140				
	11-15 year	24.00	3.32	62				
	16 & above	24.86	3.83	42				
Industrial Experience	Nil	24.47	3.45	235		1.082	2.631	Ns
	1-2 years	24.24	3.35	54				
	3-4 years	23.27	4.16	30				
	5 & above	24.26	2.99	23				
No. of registered research Scholars	None	24.26	3.48	306		0.673	2.631	Ns
	1-2 scholars	24.73	4.25	15				
	3-4 scholars	25.64	2.94	11				
	5 & above	23.90	2.56	10				
No. of Teaching Hours/week	10-15 hours	24.32	3.28	25		0.036	3.022	Ns
	16-20 hours	24.30	3.44	293				
	above 21hrs	24.50	4.15	24				
Non-academic duties	Sports	26.12	2.71	17		1.717	2.631	Ns
	Cultural	24.45	3.64	38				
	Events	24.27	3.58	134				
	Any other	24.12	3.38	153				
Number of FDP attended	1-2	24.47	3.91	55		0.905	2.631	Ns
	3-4	23.82	3.23	97				
	5-6	24.50	3.16	78				
	Above 7	24.54	3.66	112				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level)

(Source: primary data)

The mean knowledge scores were found out separately for the different groups in the job related profile and the following null hypotheses was framed and tested.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean knowledge scores of the faculty and the job related profile namely-category of employment, designation, teaching experience, industrial experience, number of registered research scholars, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty

**Category of Employment:** Higher mean knowledge score of 25.59 were for faculty from aided college and a lower mean knowledge score of 24.15 in faculty of self-finance college. The t-test value of 2.63 is higher than the table value of 2.59 at 1% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is significant difference between the average knowledge scores of aided college faculty and self-finance college faculty.

**Designation:** The mean knowledge scores are similar for both, assistant professors 24.31 and associate professors 24.38. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 0.12 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores of assistant professors and associate professors.

**Teaching Experience:** The highest mean knowledge score of 24.86 is for faculty with teaching experience of more than 16 years. The mean scores are similar for the other faculty with teaching experience less than 16 years. F-test value of 0.51 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores and the teaching experience of the faculty.

**Industrial Experience:** The highest mean knowledge score of 24.47 is for faculty without industrial experience. The F-test value of 1.08 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores and the industrial experience of the faculty.

**Number of Registered Research Scholars:** The lowest mean knowledge score is for the faculty guiding/guided above 5 scholars. For the other groups the mean scores are similar. F-test value of 0.67 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores and number of research scholars guiding/guided by the faculty.

**Number of Teaching Hours/Week:** The mean knowledge scores are similar for the faculty groups with different working hours. F-test value of 0.03 is less than the table value of 3.02.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores and number of teaching hour per week of the faculty.

**Non-academic Duties:** The highest mean knowledge score of 26.16 is for faculty with the non-academic duty of sports. The other non-academic duties have a similar mean score. F-test value of 1.71 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores and non-academic duties of the faculty.

**Number of Faculty Development Programmes Attended:** The highest mean score of 24.54 is for faculty who have attended more than seven faculty development programmes. The lowest mean score is for faculty who have attended three to four programmes. F-test value of (0.90) is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average knowledge scores and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

## **RESULT**

t-Test result shows that there is a significance different between mean knowledge scores and the job related profile namely category of employment. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between the mean knowledge scores and job related profile namely designation. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.



ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean knowledge scores and the job related profile variables of teaching experience, industrial experience, number of registered research scholars, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

### ANALYSIS OF SKILL SCORES

The skill score is total of the self-evaluation made by the faculty on 8 items on a 5 point rating scale. The ratings assigned are 5-excellent, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-fair, 1-poor for each of the items. Skill scores were found out by adding the ratings given for the 8 items. This was further analysed by comparing it with the selected socio-economic profile parameters and the job related profile parameters of the target faculty. The mean skill scores were found for each group of the selected variables which are shown below in the table 4.7 and 4.8.

**Table 4.7 - Skill Scores by Personal Socio-Economic Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Table Value	Sig
Age	Up to 30 years	34.09	3.47	93	0.717	4.585	3.367	**
	31-35 years	34.33	4.54	108				
	36-40 years	35.68	3.34	80				
	41-45 years	32.63	4.67	40				
	Above 46 years	33.00	5.16	21				
Gender	Male	33.99	4.19	72	0.717		1.967	Ns
	Female	34.38	4.15	270				
Monthly Income	Up to 20000	33.86	4.02	136	0.986		2.631	Ns
	20001-30000	34.71	4.25	115				
	30001-40000	34.19	4.16	37				
	Above-40000	34.59	4.27	54				
Residential Area	Rural	34.43	4.18	65	0.306		3.022	Ns
	Urban	34.18	4.16	224				
	Semi-Urban	34.64	4.13	53				

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Table Value	Sig
School Education	English	34.35	4.13	281	0.516		1.967	Ns
	Vernacular	34.05	4.28	61				
Highest Educational Qualification	Postgraduate	33.00	4.17	35		3.419	3.022	*
	M.Phil.	34.44	4.27	180				
	Ph.D.	34.89	3.89	127				
Additional Qualification	None	34.40	4.11	240		3.347	2.631	*
	SLET	34.03	3.88	37				
	NET	32.74	4.43	38				
	Any Other	35.93	3.95	27				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \* - Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level) (Source: Primary Data)

The skill scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following null hypotheses was framed and tested.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean skill scores of the faculty and the socio-economic profile parameters of age, gender, monthly income(personal), residential area, medium of school instruction, educational qualifications and additional qualification.

**Age:** The highest skill mean score is in the age group of 36 to 40 years with a mean of 35.68 and the lowest knowledge score is in the age group of 41 to 45 years with a mean of 32.63. The ANOVA- F test was applied to test the level of significance. F-test value of (2.50) is higher than the table value of (4.58) at 1% level of significance.

Thus it can be inferred that the average skill scores differ significantly between the age groups of the faculty.

**Gender:** The table shows that the mean skill score of male is 33.99 and the mean skill score for female is 34.38. T-test was applied and the t-test value of (0.71) is less than the table value of (1.96) at 5% level of significance

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores of male and female faculty.

**Monthly Income (Personal):** Lowest mean skill score of 33.86 is found among faculty with a personal income of less than Rs.20,000 and the remaining mean skill scores are similar. F-test value of (0.98) is lower than the table value of (2.63) at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill score and the monthly income (personal) of the faculty.

**Residential Area:** The mean skill scores are similar for the area of residence with lowest score of 34.18 for urban residential area. F-test value of (0.30) is lower than the table value of (3.02) at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the average skill score and the residential area of the faculty.

**Medium of School Education:** The mean skill scores are similar for the medium of school education whether English or vernacular like Tamil, Malayalam and others. The mean score for school education in English medium is (34.35) and for Vernacular medium is (34.05). The t-test value of (0.51) is less than the table value of (1.96) at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill score and the medium of school education of the faculty.

**Educational Qualification:** The highest mean skill score of (34.89) is for faculty with Ph.D. qualification and the lowest of (33.00) is for faculty with post-graduation. F-test value of (3.41) is higher than the table value of (3.02) at 5% level of significance.

Thus, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the average skill scores and the educational qualification of the faculty.

**Additional Qualification:** Faculty with other additional qualification like B.Ed., MBA etc have a higher mean skill score of (35.93). The mean skill scores for NET qualification is the lowest at 32.74. F-test value of (3.34) is higher than the table value of (2.63) at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the average skill score and the additional qualification of the faculty

## RESULT

ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between mean skill scores and the socio-economic variables namely age, educational qualification and additional qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean skill scores and the socio-economic variables namely monthly income (personal) and residential area. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between mean skill scores and the socio-economic variables namely gender and medium of school instruction. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4.8 Skill Scores by Job-Related Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t- Value	F Score	Table Value	Sig
Category of employment	Aided college	35.52	3.59	44	2.106		1.967	*
	Self-finance college	34.12	4.20	298				
Designation	Assistant Professor	34.37	4.02	294	0.799		1.967	Ns
	Associate Professor	33.85	4.88	48				
Teaching Experience	1 - 5 years	34.57	3.57	98		0.266	2.631	Ns
	6 - 10 years	34.14	4.37	140				
	11-15 year	34.39	3.78	62				
	16 & above	34.05	5.20	42				
Industrial Experience	Nil	34.49	4.01	235		0.689	2.631	Ns
	1-2 years	34.04	4.53	54				
	3-4 years	33.43	4.73	30				
	5 & above	34.09	3.98	23				

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Table Value	Sig
No. of registered Research Scholars	None	34.23	4.14	306		0.340	2.631	Ns
	1-2 scholars	34.80	5.33	15				
	3-4 scholars	35.36	3.80	11				
	5 & above	34.40	3.20	10				
No. of Teaching Hours/week	10-15 hours	33.52	4.42	25		0.514	3.022	Ns
	16-20 hours	34.38	4.09	293				
	above 21hrs	34.13	4.73	24				
Non-academic duties	Sports	35.00	3.71	17		0.797	2.631	Ns
	Cultural	34.47	3.91	38				
	Events	34.58	4.12	134				
	Any other	33.93	4.28	153				
Number of FDP attended	1-2	34.58	4.37	55		0.437	2.631	Ns
	3-4	34.04	4.21	97				
	5-6	34.64	3.42	78				
	Above 7	34.14	4.48	112				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level) (Source: Primary Data)

The mean skill scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is framed to test for differences.

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean skill scores of the target faculty and the job related profile parameters of category of employment, designation, teaching experience, industrial experience, number of research scholars guiding/guided, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty

**Category of Employment:** Higher mean skill score of 35.52 is found among faculty of aided college and a lower mean skill score of 34.12 in faculty of self-finance college. The t-test value of 2.10 is higher than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is significant difference between the average skill scores of aided college faculty and self-finance college faculty.

**Designation:** The mean skill scores are similar for both the designations, assistant professors 34.37 and associate professors 33.85. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 0.79 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores of assistant professors and associate professors.

**Teaching Experience:** The highest mean skill score of 34.57 is for faculty with teaching experience of 1-5 years. The mean scores are similar for the other faculty. F-test value of 0.26 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores and the teaching experience of the faculty.

**Industrial Experience:** The highest mean skill score of 34.49 is for faculty without industrial experience. The F-test value of 0.68 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores and the industrial experience of the faculty.

**Number of Registered Research Scholars:** The lowest mean skill score of 34.23 is for the faculty not guiding/guided any scholars. For the other groups the mean skill scores are similar. F-test value of 0.34 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores and number of research scholars registered with the faculty.

**Number of Teaching Hours/Week:** The highest mean skill scores of 34.38 is for the faculty with the number of teaching hour between 16-20 hours. The mean scores are similar for the other faculty. F-test value of 0.51 is less than the table value of 3.02.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores and number of teaching hour per week of the faculty.

**Non-academic Duties:** The highest mean skill score of 35.00 is for faculty with the non-academic duty of sports. The other non-academic duties have a similar mean score. F-test value of 0.79 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores and non-academic duties of the faculty.

**Number of Faculty Development Programmes Attended:** The highest skill mean score of 34.64 is for faculty who have attended 5-6 faculty development programmes. The lowest skill mean score of 34.14 is for faculty who have attended more than 7 programmes. F-test value of 0.43 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average skill scores and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

## **RESULT**

t-Test result shows that there is a significance different between mean skill scores and the job related profile namely category of employment. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between the mean knowledge scores and job related profile namely designation. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean knowledge scores and the job related profile variables of teaching experience, industrial experience, number of registered research scholars, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

## **ANALYSIS OF MOTIVE SCORES**

The motive score is total of the self-evaluation made by the faculty on 12 items on a 5 point rating scale. The ratings assigned are 5-excellent, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-fair, 1-poor for each of the items. Motive scores were found out by adding the ratings given for the 12 items. This was further analysed by comparing it with the selected socio-economic profile parameters and the job related profile parameters of the target faculty. The mean motive scores were found for each group of the selected variables which are shown below in the table 4.9 and 4.10.

**Table 4.9 Motive Scores by Personal Socio-Economic Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Table Value	Sig
Age	Up to 30 yrs	51.87	5.91	93		4.504	3.367	**
	31-35 years	52.03	6.31	108				
	36-40 years	54.43	4.22	80				
	41-45 years	49.78	7.36	40				
	Above 46 yrs	51.67	7.56	21				
Gender	Male	51.69	6.48	72	0.882		1.967	Ns
	Female	52.41	6.03	270				
Monthly Income	Up to 20000	51.76	6.47	136		1.060	2.631	Ns
	20001-30000	52.80	5.57	115				
	30001-40000	51.41	5.80	37				
	Above-40000	52.94	6.53	54				
Residential Area	Rural	52.82	6.04	65		0.419	3.022	Ns
	Urban	52.05	6.24	224				
	Semi-Urban	52.45	5.80	53				
School Education	English	52.27	6.10	281	0.066		1.967	Ns
	Vernacular	52.21	6.27	61				
Educational Qualification	Post graduate	50.26	6.27	35		3.758	3.022	*
	M.Phil	51.96	6.43	180				
	Ph.D	53.24	5.47	127				
Additional Qualification	None	52.30	6.19	240		1.998	2.631	Ns
	SLET	52.81	5.04	37				
	NET	50.34	6.56	38				
	Any Other	53.89	5.93	27				
Total number of respondents 342								

Ns - Not Significant, \* - Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level)

(Source: Primary Data)



The motive scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is formed to test for significant differences.

**H<sub>05</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean motive scores of the target faculty and the socio-economic profile parameters of age, gender, monthly income (personal), residential area, medium of school instruction, educational qualifications and additional qualification

**Age:** The highest motive mean score is in the age group of 36 to 40 years with a mean of 54.43 and the lowest motive score is in the age group of 41 to 45 years with a mean of 49.78. The ANOVA F test was applied to test the level of significance. F-test value of 4.50 is higher than the table value of 3.36 at 1% level of significance.

Thus it can be inferred that the average motive scores differ significantly between the age groups of the faculty.

**Gender:** The table shows that the mean motive score of male is 51.69 and the mean motive score for female is 52.42, which are similar. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 0.88 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive scores of male and female faculty.

**Monthly Income (Personal):** Lowest mean motive score of 51.41 is found among faculty with a personal income of Rs.30,001-Rs.40,000. F-test value of 1.06 is lower than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive score and the monthly income (personal) of the faculty.

**Residential Area:** The mean motive scores are similar for the area of residence with lowest score of 52.05 for urban residential area. F-test value of 0.41 is lower than the table value of 3.02 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the average motive score and the residential area of the faculty.

**Medium of School Education:** The mean motive scores are similar for the medium of school education whether English or vernacular like Tamil, Malayalam and others. The mean score for school education in English medium is 52.27 and for Vernacular medium is 52.21. The t-test value of 0.06 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive score and the medium of school education of the faculty.

**Highest Educational Qualification:** The highest motive score of 53.24 is for faculty with Ph.D. qualification and the lowest of 50.26 is for faculty with post-graduation. F-test value of 3.75 is higher than the table value of 3.02 at 5% level of significance.

Thus, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the average motive scores and the educational qualification of the faculty.

**Additional Qualification:** The mean motive scores for the faculty with NET qualification is the lowest 50.34. Faculty with other additional qualifications like B.Ed., MBA etc. have a highest mean score of 53.89. F-test value of 1.99 is lower than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the average motive score and the additional qualification of the faculty

## **RESULT**

ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between mean motive scores and the socio-economic variables namely age and the educational qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean motive scores and the socio-economic variables namely monthly income (personal), residential area and additional qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between mean motive scores and the socio-economic variables namely gender and medium of school instruction. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4.10 Motive Scores by Job-Related Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
Category of employment	Aided college	53.98	5.22	44	2.001		1.967	*
	Self-finance college	52.01	6.22	298				
Designation	Assistant Professor	52.47	6.01	294	1.592		1.967	Ns
	Associate Professor	50.96	6.72	48				
Teaching Experience	1 - 5 years	52.80	5.70	98		0.428	2.631	Ns
	6 - 10 years	51.89	6.46	140				
	11-15 year	52.19	5.43	62				
	16 & above	52.36	6.99	42				
Industrial Experience	Nil	52.56	5.90	235		0.815	2.631	Ns
	1-2 years	51.72	6.22	54				
	3-4 years	50.90	7.05	30				
	5 & above	52.26	6.96	23				
Number of Registered Research Scholars	None	52.22	6.04	306		0.089	2.631	Ns
	1-2 scholars	52.33	7.99	15				
	3-4 scholars	53.18	6.98	11				
	5 & above	52.40	5.46	10				
No. of Teaching Hours/week	10-15 hours	51.36	6.19	25		1.456	3.022	Ns
	16-20 hours	52.48	5.87	293				
	above 21hrs	50.50	8.64	24				
Non-academic duties	Sports	53.53	5.23	17		1.469	2.631	Ns
	Cultural	52.03	6.10	38				
	Events	52.95	5.86	134				
	Any other	51.58	6.42	153				
Number of FDP attended	1-2	52.04	7.14	55		0.594	2.631	Ns
	3-4	51.65	6.16	97				
	5-6	52.73	5.22	78				
	Above 7	52.57	6.17	112				
Total number of respondents 342								

Ns - Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level)

(Source: Primary Data)

The mean motive scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is framed to test for differences.

**H<sub>06</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean motive scores of the target faculty and the job related profile parameters of category of employment, designation, teaching experience, industrial experience, number of research scholars registered, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

**Category of Employment:** Higher mean motive score of 53.98 is found among faculty of aided college and a lower mean motive score of 52.01 in faculty of self-finance college. The t-test value of 2.00 is higher than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is significant difference between the average motive scores of aided college faculty and self-finance college faculty.

**Designation:** Higher mean motive score of 52.47 is found among assistant professors and a lower mean motive score of 50.96 for associate professors. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 1.56 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive scores of assistant professors and associate professors.

**Teaching Experience:** The highest mean skill score of 52.80 is for faculty with teaching experience of 1 - 5 years. The mean scores are similar for the other faculties. F-test value of 0.42 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the motive scores and the teaching experience of the faculty.

**Industrial Experience:** The highest mean motive score of 52.56 is for faculty without industrial experience. The F-test value of 0.81 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive scores and the industrial experience of the faculty.

**Number of Registered Research Scholars:** The lowest mean motive score of 52.22 is for the faculty not guiding/guided scholars. For the other groups the mean motive scores are similar. F-test value of 0.89 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive scores and number of research scholars guiding/guided by the faculty.

**Number of Teaching Hours/Week:** The lowest mean motive score of 50.50 is for faculty with teaching hours above 21 hours. F-test value of 1.45 is less than the table value of 3.02.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive scores and number of teaching hour per week of the faculty.

**Non-academic Duties:** The highest mean motive score of 53.53 is for faculty with the non-academic duty of sports. The other non-academic duties have a similar mean score. F-test value of 1.46 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the motive scores and non-academic duties of the faculty.

**Number of Faculty Development Programmes Attended:** The highest motive mean score of 52.73 is for faculty who have attended five to six faculty development programmes. For the other groups the mean motive scores are similar F-test value of 0.59 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average motive scores and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

## **RESULT**

t-Test result shows that there is a significance different between mean motive scores and the job related profile namely category of employment. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between the mean motive scores and job related profile namely designation. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean motive scores and the job related profile variables of teaching experience, industrial experience, number of registered research scholars, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

### ANALYSIS OF TRAITS SCORE

The traits score is total of the self-evaluation made by the faculty on 10 items on a 5 point rating scale. The ratings assigned are 5-excellent, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-fair, 1-poor for each of the items. Traits scores were found out by adding the ratings given for the 10 items. This was further analysed by comparing it with the selected socio-economic profile parameters and the job related profile parameters of the target faculty. The mean traits scores were found for each group of the selected variables which are shown below in the table 4.11 and 4.12.

**Table 4.11 Traits Scores by Personal Socio-Economic Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
Age	Up to 30 yrs	42.54	5.19	93		3.712	3.367	**
	31-35 years	43.19	5.19	108				
	36-40 years	44.89	3.96	80				
	41-45 years	41.43	6.52	40				
	Above 46 yrs	42.62	6.55	21				
Gender	Male	42.76	5.70	72	0.733		1.967	Ns
	Female	43.28	5.17	270				
Monthly Income	Up to 20000	42.22	5.33	136		2.536	2.631	Ns
	20001-30000	43.95	4.76	115				
	30001-40000	43.62	6.10	37				
	Above-40000	43.59	5.42	54				
Residential Area	Rural	42.94	5.06	65		0.076	3.022	NS
	Urban	43.22	5.42	224				
	Semi-Urban	43.23	5.02	53				

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
School Education	English	43.21	5.24	281	0.276		1.967	Ns
	Vernacular	43.00	5.49	61				
Educational Qualification	Postgraduate	41.74	5.04	35		6.990	4.668	**
	M.Phil.	42.51	5.29	180				
	Ph.D.	44.50	5.09	127				
Additional Qualification	None	43.11	5.27	240		2.271	2.631	Ns
	SLET	43.76	4.82	37				
	NET	41.68	5.76	38				
	Any Other	45.00	4.92	27				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \* - Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level) (Source: Primary Data)

The trait scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is formed to test for significant differences.

**H<sub>0</sub>7:** There is no significant difference between the mean trait scores of the target faculty and the socio-economic profile parameters of age, gender, monthly income (personal), residential area, medium of school instruction, educational qualifications and additional qualification

**Age:** The highest trait mean score is in the age group of 36 to 40 years with a mean of 44.89 and the lowest motive score is in the age group of 41 to 45 years with a mean of 41.43. The ANOVA F test was applied to test the level of significance. F-test value of 3.71 is higher than the table value of 3.36 at 1% level of significance.

Thus it can be inferred that the average trait scores differ significantly between the age groups of the faculty.

**Gender:** The table shows that the mean trait score of male is 42.76 and the mean trait score for female is 43.28, which are similar. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 0.73 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average trait scores of male and female faculty.

**Monthly Income (Personal):** Lowest mean trait score of 42.22 is found among faculty with a personal income up to Rs. 20,000. F-test value of 2.53 is lower than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average trait score and the monthly income (personal) of the faculty.

**Residential Area:** The mean trait scores are similar for the area of residence with lowest score of 42.94 for rural residential area. F-test value of 0.07 is lower than the table value of 3.02 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the average trait score and the residential area of the faculty.

**Medium of School Education:** The mean trait scores are similar for the medium of school education whether English or vernacular like Tamil, Malayalam and others. The t-test value of 0.27 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average trait score and the medium of school education of the faculty.

**Highest Educational Qualification:** The highest trait score of 44.50 is for faculty with Ph.D. qualification and the lowest of 41.74 is for faculty with only post-graduation. F-test value of 6.990 is higher than the table value of (4.668) at 1% level of significance.

Thus, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the average trait scores and the educational qualification of the faculty.

**Additional Qualification:** The mean trait scores for the faculty with NET qualification is the lowest 41.68. Faculty with other additional qualifications like B.Ed., MBA etc. have a highest mean score of 45.00. F-test value of 2.27 is lower than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the average trait score and the additional qualification of the faculty



## RESULT

ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between mean trait scores and the socio-economic variables namely age and the educational qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean trait scores and the socio-economic variables namely monthly income (personal), residential area and additional qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between mean trait scores and the socio-economic variables namely gender and medium of school instruction. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4.12 Traits Scores by Personal Job-Related Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t- Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
Category of employment	Aided college	44.68	4.47	44	2.044		1.967	*
	Self-finance college	42.95	5.36	298				
Designation	Assistant Professor	43.24	5.07	294	0.623		1.967	Ns
	Associate Professor	42.73	6.48	48				
Teaching Experience	1 - 5 years	43.10	4.94	98		1.463	2.631	Ns
	6 - 10 years	42.62	5.33	140				
	11-15 year	44.26	4.56	62				
	16 & above	43.55	6.63	42				
Industrial Experience	Nil	43.32	5.17	235		1.269	2.631	NS
	1-2 years	43.72	4.87	54				
	3-4 years	41.77	6.02	30				
	5 & above	42.13	6.20	23				
Number of Registered Research Scholars	None	43.01	5.16	306		1.496	2.631	Ns
	1-2 scholars	44.40	6.81	15				
	3-4 scholars	46.09	4.95	11				
	5 & above	43.00	6.51	10				

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
No. of Teaching Hours/ week	10-15 hours	42.84	5.58	25		0.078	3.022	Ns
	16-20 hours	43.22	5.18	293				
	above 21hrs	42.96	6.31	24				
Non-academic duties	Sports	44.41	4.80	17		0.830	2.631	Ns
	Cultural	42.50	5.74	38				
	Events	43.51	4.96	134				
	Any other	42.90	5.49	153				
Number of FDP attended	1-2	42.49	6.01	55		2.422	2.631	Ns
	3-4	42.23	5.44	97				
	5-6	43.95	4.59	78				
	Above 7	43.78	5.11	112				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level) (Source: Primary Data)

The mean trait scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is framed to test for differences.

**H<sub>08</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean traits scores of the target faculty and the job related profile parameters of category of employment, designation, teaching experience, industrial experience, number of research scholars guiding/guided, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty

**Category of Employment:** Higher mean traits score of 44.68 is found among faculty of aided college and a lower mean trait score of 42.95 in faculty of self-finance college. The t-test value of 2.04 is higher than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is significant difference between the average traits scores of aided college faculty and self-finance college faculty.

**Designation:** Higher mean traits score of 43.24 is found among assistant professors and a lower mean motive score of 42.73 for associate professors. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 1.56 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average traits scores of assistant professors and associate professors.

**Teaching Experience:** The highest mean traits score of 44.26 is for faculty with teaching experience of 11- 15 years. The mean traits scores are similar for the other faculties. F-test value of 1.46 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the traits scores and the teaching experience of the faculty.

**Industrial Experience:** The highest mean traits score of 43.73 is for faculty with 1 – 2 years of industrial experience. The F-test value of 1.26 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average traits scores and the industrial experience of the faculty.

**Number of Registered Research Scholars:** The lowest mean traits score of 43.00 is for the faculty guiding/guided more than 5 scholars. For the other groups the mean traits scores are similar. F-test value of 1.49 is less than the table value of 2.63. Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average traits scores and number of research scholars registered with the faculty.

**Number of Teaching Hours/Week:** The highest mean traits score of 43.22 is for faculty with teaching hours between 16-20 hours. F-test value of 0.07 is less than the table value of 3.02.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average traits scores and number of teaching hour per week of the faculty.

**Non-academic Duties:** The highest mean traits score of 44.41 is for faculty with the non-academic duty of sports. The other non-academic duties have a similar mean score. F-test value of 0.83 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the traits scores and non-academic duties of the faculty.

**Number of Faculty Development Programmes Attended:** The highest traits mean score of 43.95 is for faculty who have attended five to six faculty development programmes. For the other groups the mean traits scores are similar F-test value of 2.42 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average traits scores and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

## **RESULT**

t-Test result shows that there is a significance different between mean traits scores and the job related profile namely category of employment. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between the mean traits scores and job related profile namely designation. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean traits scores and the job related profile variables of teaching experience, industrial experience, number of registered research scholars, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

## **ANALYSIS OF SELF-CONCEPT SCORE**

The self-concept score is total of the self-evaluation made by the faculty on 9 items on a 5 point rating scale. The ratings assigned are 5-excellent, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-fair, 1-poor for each of the items. Self-concept scores were found out by adding the ratings given for the 9 items. This was further analysed by comparing it with the selected socio-economic profile parameters and the job related profile parameters of the target faculty. The mean self-concept scores were found for each group of the selected variables which are shown below in the table 4.13 and 4.14.

**Table 4.13 Self-Concept Scores by Personal Socio-Economic Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
Age	Up to 30 yrs	37.73	4.45	93		2.363	3.367	Ns
	31-35 years	38.14	4.82	108				
	36-40 years	39.31	4.24	80				
	41-45 years	36.88	5.60	40				
	Above 46 yrs	36.95	6.45	21				
Gender	Male	37.92	5.20	72	0.325		1.967	Ns
	Female	38.13	4.75	270				
Monthly Income	Up to 20000	37.47	4.79	136		1.647	2.631	Ns
	20001-30000	38.81	4.66	115				
	30001-40000	37.84	4.96	37				
	Above-40000	38.24	5.17	54				
Residential Area	Rural	37.98	4.83	65		0.01	3.022	Ns
	Urban	38.12	4.91	224				
	Semi-Urban	38.06	4.64	53				
School Education	English	38.16	4.71	281	0.612		1.967	Ns
	Vernacular	37.74	5.42	61				
Educational Qualification	Post graduate	36.37	4.37	35		3.657	3.022	*
	M.Phil	37.92	4.86	180				
	Ph.D	38.78	4.84	127				
Additional Qualification	None	38.40	4.87	240		3.330	2.631	*
	SLET	38.05	4.36	37				
	NET	35.79	4.39	38				
	Any Other	38.56	5.21	27				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level)

(Source: Primary Data)

The self-concept scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is formed to test for significant differences.

**H<sub>09</sub>:** There is no significant difference between the mean self-concept scores of the target faculty and the socio-economic profile parameters of age, gender, monthly income (personal), residential area, medium of school instruction, educational qualifications and additional qualification

**Age:** The highest self-concept mean score is in the age group of 36 to 40 years with a mean of 39.31 and the lowest self-concept score is in the age group of 41 to 45 years with a mean of 36.88. The ANOVA F test was applied to test the level of significance. F-test value of 2.36 is less than the table value of 3.36 at 5 % level of significance.

Thus it can be inferred that the average self-concept scores does not differ significantly between the age groups of the faculty.

**Gender:** The table shows that the mean self-concept score of male is 37.92 and the mean self-concept score for female is 38.13, which are similar. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 0.32 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores of male and female faculty.

**Monthly Income (Personal):** The mean self-concept scores are similar for the monthly income of the faculties, with the lowest mean self-concept score of 37.47 found among faculty with a personal income Rs.20,000. F-test value of 1.67 is lower than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept score and the monthly income (personal) of the faculty.

**Residential Area:** The mean self-concept scores are similar for the area of residence with lowest score of 37.98 for rural residential area. F-test value of 0.01 is lower than the table value of 3.02 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, there is no significant difference between the average self-concept score and the residential area of the faculty.

**Medium of School Education:** The mean self-concept scores are similar for the medium of school education whether English or vernacular like Tamil, Malayalam and others. The mean score for school education in English medium is 38.16 and for Vernacular medium is 37.74. The t-test value of 0.61 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept score and the medium of school education of the faculty.

**Highest Educational Qualification:** The highest self-concept score of 38.78 is for faculty with Ph.D. qualification and the lowest of 36.37 is for faculty with post-graduation. F-test value of 3.65 is higher than the table value of 3.02 at 5% level of significance.

Thus, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the average self-concept scores and the educational qualification of the faculty.

**Additional Qualification:** The mean self-concept scores for the faculty with NET qualification are the lowest at 35.79. Faculty with other additional qualification like B.Ed., MBA etc. have a highest mean score of 38.56. F-test value of 3.33 is higher than the table value of 2.63 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the average self-concept score and the additional qualification of the faculty

## **RESULT**

ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between mean self-concept scores and the socio-economic variables namely educational qualification and additional qualification. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean self-concept scores and the socio-economic variables namely age, monthly income (personal) and residential area. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between mean skill scores and the socio-economic variables namely gender and medium of school instruction. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4.14 Self-Concept Scores by Personal Job-Related Profile Parameters**

Profile Variable	Groups	Mean	S.D	No. of Respondents	t-Value	F Score	Total Value	Sig
Category of employment	Aided college	38.84	4.02	44	1.115		1.967	Ns
	Self-finance college	37.97	4.95	298				
Designation	Assistant Professor	38.16	4.67	294	0.705		1.967	Ns
	Associate Professor	37.63	5.83	48				
Teaching Experience	1 - 5 years	38.13	4.44	98		0.681	2.631	Ns
	6 - 10 years	37.76	4.90	140				
	11-15 year	38.81	4.23	62				
	16 & above	37.98	6.25	42				
Industrial Experience	Nil	38.22	4.76	235		1.895	2.631	Ns
	1-2 years	38.48	4.60	54				
	3-4 years	36.10	5.68	30				
	5 & above	38.30	4.74	23				
Number of Registered Research Scholars	None	38.06	4.77	306		0.022	2.631	Ns
	1-2 scholars	38.13	6.74	15				
	3-4 scholars	38.27	4.86	11				
	5 & above	38.40	4.58	10				
No. of Teaching Hours/week	10-15 hours	37.48	4.66	25		0.420	3.022	Ns
	16-20 hours	38.08	4.87	293				
	above 21hrs	38.75	4.80	24				
Non-academic duties	Sports	39.59	4.32	17		1.103	2.631	Ns
	Cultural	37.92	4.46	38				
	Events	38.40	4.96	134				
	Any other	37.68	4.87	153				
Number of FDP attended	1-2	37.84	5.14	55		1.221	2.631	Ns
	3-4	37.43	4.91	97				
	5-6	38.77	4.11	78				
	Above 7	38.29	5.08	112				
Total number of respondents 342								

(Ns - Not Significant, \*- Significant at 5% level, \*\* - Significant at 1% level)

(Source: Primary Data)



The mean self-concept scores were found out separately for the different groups and the following hypotheses is framed to test for differences.

**H<sub>0</sub>10:** There is no significant difference between the mean self-concept scores of the target faculty and the job related profile parameters of category of employment, designation, teaching experience, industrial experience, number of research scholars registered, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty

**Category of Employment:** Higher mean self-concept score of 38.84 is found among faculty of aided college and a lower mean trait score of 37.97 in faculty of self-finance college. The t-test value of 1.11 is lower than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores of aided college faculty and self-finance college faculty.

**Designation:** Higher mean self-concept score of 38.16 is found among assistant professors and a lower mean motive score of 37.63 for associate professors. T-test was applied and the t-test value of 0.70 is less than the table value of 1.96 at 5% level of significance.

Hence, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores of assistant professors and associate professors.

**Teaching Experience:** The highest mean self-concept score of 38.81 is for faculty with teaching experience of 11- 15 years. The mean traits scores are similar for the other faculties. F-test value of 0.68 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the self-concept scores and the teaching experience of the faculty.

**Industrial Experience:** The highest mean self-concept score of 38.48 is for faculty with 1 – 2 years of industrial experience. The F-test value of 1.89 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores and the industrial experience of the faculty.

**Number of Registered Research Scholars:** The lowest mean self-concept score of 38.06 is for the faculty not guiding/guided any scholars. For the other groups the mean self-concept scores are similar. F-test value of 0.02 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores and number of research scholars guiding/guided by the faculty.

**Number of Teaching Hours/Week:** The highest mean self-concept score of 38.75 is for faculty with teaching hours more than 21 hours/week. F-test value of 0.42 is less than the table value of 3.02.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores and number of teaching hour per week of the faculty.

**Non-academic Duties:** The highest mean self-concept score of 39.59 is for faculty with the non-academic duty of sports. The other non-academic duties have a similar mean score. F-test value of 1.10 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the self-concept scores and non-academic duties of the faculty.

**Number of Faculty Development Programmes Attended:** The highest self-concept mean score of 38.77 is for faculty who have attended five to six faculty development programmes. For the other groups the mean self-concept scores are similar F-test value of 1.22 is less than the table value of 2.63.

Hence, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the average self-concept scores and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty.

## **RESULT**

t-Test result shows that there is no significance different between the mean self-concept scores and job related profile namely category of employment and designation. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

ANOVA result shows that there is no significant difference between mean self-concept scores and the job related profile variables of teaching experience, industrial

experience, number of registered research scholars, number of teaching hours/week, non-academic duties and number of faculty development programmes attended by the faculty. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

### **CORRELATION BETWEEN THE COMPETENCIES**

Correlations were found between all the five competencies and the correlation values are shown in the table below

**Table 4.15 Table on Correlation between the Competencies**

	<b>Knowledge Score</b>	<b>Skill Score</b>	<b>Motive Score</b>	<b>Traits Score</b>	<b>Self-Concept Score</b>
Knowledge Score	1	.750	.720	.673	.674
Skill Score		1	.803	.735	.713
Motive Score			1	.821	.735
Traits Score				1	.760
Self-Concept Score				.	1

The correlation table shows that there is high correlation between the five competencies. The highest correlation being 0.821 between motive and traits and a lesser correlation being 0.673 between knowledge and traits. The correlation scores for all the five competencies are higher than 0.6 which indicates that there is a high level of positive correlations between the five competencies at 1% level of significances.