CHAPTER

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

'A person is more likely to accept a new idea if he has had a part in creating, developing and planning it; and if he is recognized by others as one of the authors of the new idea.'

- Griffin Willis H. and Pareek Udai, 'The Process of Planned Change in Education, Bombay, Somaiya Publications Pvt. Ltd., 1970, p.88.

V

ANALYSIS AND THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the analysis and interpretation of the data collected from 1000 Secondary and Higher Secondary School teachers with the help of innovative Proneness Scale devised and standardized by the investigator. One of the objectives of the study is to measure the Innovative Proneness of teachers according to their Age, Sex, Teaching Experience, Academic Qualifications, Professional Qualifications, Mobility, In-service Education, Professional Reading Habits and Professional Satisfaction. Moreover, the investigator has tried to analyse the Innovative Proneness of Teachers according to the Districts, Ageswise, Sex type of the school , Stream of the school, Category of the teachers according to high, medium and low Innovative Proneness, and also Inter-correlation Matrix of 21 components of the tool and 9 variables of the teachers and 6 variables of schools is computed.

5.2 Innovative Proneness in the Districts of Gujarat

Table :5.1: Districtwise Innovative Proneness of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers

Sr. No.	Name of the District	Mean	SD	t-value
1.	Ahmedabad	547.51	87.89	0.02 NS
2.	Amreli	547.15	54.13	2.09 *
3.	Banaskantha	583.70	56.30	2.41 *
4.	Baroda	567.63	81.62	1.50 NS
5.	Bhavnagar	514.85	80.84	1.17 NS
6.	Broach	618.03	75.87	1.64 NS
7.	Dang	474.70	59.57	1.73 NS
8.	Gandhinagar	524.18	86.16	0.47 NS
9.	Jamnagar	532.63	63.42	1.00 NS
10.	Junagadh	514.85	80.84	2.65 **
11.	Kaira	558.91	92.01	1.22 NS
12.	Kutch-Bhuj	532.70	61.35	0.07 NS
13.	Mehsana	531.44	75.37	0.85 NS
14.	Panchmahal	543.62	105.88	1.51 NS
15.	Rajkot	519.20	69.38	1.78 NS
16.	Sabarkantha	540.63	62.59	1.49 NS
17.	Surendranagar	561.30	60.09	0.96 NS
18.	Surat	547.75	65.06	0.15 NS
19.	Valsad	545.83	75.86	0.13 NS
	Ahmedabad	547.51	87.89	

Highest Mean 583.70
General Mean 537.21
Lowest Mean 474.70
Maximum Possible Score 474.70

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
NS Not Significant

The Table 5.1 shows the districtwise means, standard deviations and t-values of Innovative Proneness. It could be inferred from this table that there is a significant difference of means between Amreli and Banaskantha district at .05 level. Innovative Proneness is found to be higher in Banaskantha district as compared to Amreli district. Again, Banaskantha district has been compared with Baroda district and there is a significant difference of means between Banaskantha district and Baroda district at .05 level. Innovative Proneness is found to be higher in Banaskantha district as compared to Baroda district. From the same table, again it could be inferred that there is a significant difference of means between Junagadh district and Kaira district at .01 level. Innovative Proneness is found to be higher in Kaira district as compared to Junagadh district. Rest of the t-values in this table are insignificant. From this table it could be further observed that, as compared to other districts, Banaskantha district possesses the highest mean and Dang district possesses the lowest mean on Innovative Proneness as a whole

5.2.1 Attitudes to Innovation, Situational and Innovation Characteristics, and Change Related Values in Various Districts of Gujarat

Table 5.2 shows that the sectionwise means, SDs and t and some values in various districts of Gujarat. Some values are significant

Table :5.2: 'Attitude to Innovation', 'The Situational and Innovation Characteristics' and the 'Change Related Values' of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers in the Districts of Gujarat

Sr. No.	Name of the District	N	Attitudes to Innovation			The Situational and Innovation Characteristics			The Change Related Values		
			Mean	SD	t value	Mean	SD	t value	Mean	SD	t value
1.	Ahmedabad	150	120.44	20.79		207.37	48.19		222.70	34.23	
					1.62 NS			0.79 NS			0.04 NS
2.	Amreli	20	128.30	13.96		196.50	31.74		222.35	30.79	
					0.04 NS			2.07 *			1.64 NS
3.	Banaskantha	30	128.15	12.64		217.95	33.79		237.15	26.16	
					3.15 **			1.21 NS			2.11 NS
4.	Baroda	150	111.80	22.44		205.62	42.78		220.22	33.83	
					0.50 NS			1.33 NS			1.56 *
5.	Bhavnagar	150	109.73	21.91		195.60	32.92		209.53	42.82	
					0.24 NS			0.99 NS			0.17 NS
6.	Broach	30	111.23	30.41		204.00	37.79		207.93	37.98	
					1.17 NS			1.33 NS			1.75 NS
7.	Dang		99.50	13.44		186.40	32.21		188.80	22.07	
					1.91 NS			1.00 NS			1.51 NS
8.	Gandhinagar		114.20	23.45		200.18	41.10		209.80	42.58	
					0.67 NS			0.30 NS			1.04 NS
9.	Jamnagar		110.90	17.67		202.87	34.12		218.87	28.33	
					0.24 NS			0.90 NS			1.04 NS
10.	Junagadh		109.73	21.91		195.60	32.92		209.53	42.82	
					2.29 *			2.49 *			1.86 NS
11.	Kaira		119.13	23.97		215.81	46.87		223.37	38.56	
					0.43 NS			1.60 NS			0.93 NS
12.	Kutch-Bhuj		122.19	14.07		195.95	33.24		214.65	37.56	
					1.44 NS			0.79			0.08 NS
13.	Mehsana		115.16	20.62		202.35	33.04		213.93	36.87	
					2.70 **			0.43 NS			0.11 NS
14.	Panchmahal		123.65	16.81		205.30	54.73		214.67	49.42	
					2.89 **			1.11 NS			0.76 NS
15.	Rajkot		113.88	20.10		196.52	28.17		208.62	36.86	
					2.16 *			1.32 NS			0.97 NS
16.	Sabarkantha		121.41	17.73		204.51	32.32		214.71	31.20	
					1.47 NS			1.32 NS			0.50 NS
17.	Surendranagar		127.20	17.17		215.93	41.30		218.17	29.36	
					1.23 NS			1.08 NS			0.05 NS
18.	Surat		122.72	15.96		206.18	39.81		218.52	33.87	
					1.37 NS			0.34 NS			0.02 NS
19.	Valsad		118.24	20.55		208.67	42.77		218.66	37.60	
					0.68 NS			0.60 NS			0.73 NS
	Ahmedabad		120.44	20.79		204.37	48.19		222.70	34.23	

* Significant at .05 level : ** Significant at .01 level : NS Not Significant

values are insignificant.

So far as the Attitude to Innovations is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Banaskantha district and Baroda district, Mehsana district and Panchmahal district, Panchmahal district and Rajkot district at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, Panchmahal district, and again Panchmahal district respectively. Here in this chapter 'In Favour of' gives the idea of greater mean.

There is significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district, Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district, and Sabarkantha district respectively. The rest of the values are insignificant.

In all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Amreli district gives the highest mean in the case of inventory of Attitudes to Innovations and Banaskantha touches the same.

Dang district possesses the lowest mean in the case of Inventory of Attitudes to Innovations, in all the districts of Gujarat State.

From this table, it also appears that no value is highly significant, two values are significant and many values are insignificant in the case of 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics.'

So far as the situation and innovation characteristics are concerned there is a significant mean difference between Amreli district and Banaskantha district, Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.05 level, the mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, and Kaira district respectively.

The rest of the values are insignificant. However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Banaskantha district gives highest mean in the case of the situation and innovation characteristics.

Dang district possess the lowest mean in the case of the situation and innovative characteristics in all the district of Gujarat State.

Again from this table, it appears that one value is significant, and many values are insignificant. So far as the change related values are concerned.There is a significant mean difference between Baroda district and Bhavnagar district at 0.05 level. The mean difference is in favour of Baroda district. in the case of Change Related Values.

The rest of the values are insignificant. However in all the nineteen district Banaskantha district possesses highest mean in the case of the change related values. Dang district possesses the lowest mean in the case of the change related values.

5.2.2 Components of 'Attitudes ~~Towards~~ To Innovation' in Various Districts of Gujarat

Individualization :

TABLE 5.3

Individualization:

From Table 3, it appears that two values are highly significant. Some values are significant and some values are insignificant.

So far as individualisation is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Ahmedabad district and Amreli district at 0.01 level and highly significant mean difference is in favour of Amreli district. Similarly it is highly significant between Panchmahal district and Rajkot district at 0.01 level and Mean difference is in favour of Panchmahal district.

There is a significant mean difference between Amreli district and Banaskantha district, Banaskantha district and Baroda district, Junagadh districy and Kaira district, Kaira district and Kutch-Bhuj district, Kutch-Bhuj district and Mehasana district, Mehsana district and Panchmahal district, Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference

Table :5.3: Components of 'Attitudes to Innovations' in Various Districts of Gujarat

Sr. No.	District	Individualization			Curriculum Organization			Teaching-Learning Process			Teaching-Resources			Internal-School Organization			Staff Development			School Community Relationship		
		Mean	SD	t value	Mean	SD	t Value	Mean	SD	t Value	Mean	SD	t Value	Mean	SD	t Value	Mean	SD	t Value	Mean	SD	t Value
1.	Ahmedabad	20.87	4.02	2.83**	12.82	2.18	0.52NS	21.14	3.57	0.54NS	15.83	3.53	1.58NS	18.53	5.14	0.96NS	19.58	4.87	0.44NS	11.97	2.85	1.81NS
2.	Amareli	23.45	1.36	2.06*	13.10	2.43	1.12NS	21.60	3.15	0.69NS	17.15	2.63	0.75NS	19.70	3.92	0.40NS	20.10	4.79	1.76NS	13.20	2.35	0.07NS
3.	Banaskantha	22.05	2.73	2.18*	13.80	1.40	3.42**	20.95	2.82	1.80NS	16.40	3.62	1.98NS	19.15	4.67	1.64NS	22.15	2.06	3.44**	13.15	2.08	2.52*
4.	Baroda	19.80	4.45	1.34NS	11.26	3.25	1.15NS	19.20	4.15	0.34NS	14.16	4.07	0.02NS	17.34	4.47	0.69NS	18.43	4.74	1.44NS	11.21	3.31	0.83NS
5.	Bhavnagar	18.68	4.42	0.12NS	10.55	3.42	1.24NS	19.48	4.77	1.16NS	14.43	3.39	1.03NS	17.90	4.10	0.28NS	17.20	4.10	0.28NS	11.70	2.77	2.46*
6.	Broach	18.53	5.10	0.54NS	11.70	4.32	0.92NS	18.00	5.84	0.21NS	13.50	4.52	0.25NS	17.63	4.62	1.36NS	16.90	4.78	1.07NS	10.00	2.98	0.10NS
7.	Dang	17.60	3.47	1.21NS	10.40	1.80	0.49NS	17.60	2.99	1.46NS	13.10	3.60	1.18NS	15.00	1.51	2.57*	15.10	4.01	2.23*	10.10	1.00	1.29NS
8.	Gandhinagar	19.44	4.53	0.82NS	11.02	3.91	0.73NS	20.02	5.05	0.08NS	14.78	4.20	2.1*	19.16	4.30	1.25NS	18.20	4.01	0.55NS	11.66	3.79	1.59NS
9.	Jamnagar	20.20	3.03	1.57NS	11.60	2.51	1.42NS	19.93	3.55	0.44NS	12.77	4.06	1.37NS	18.0	3.52	0.11NS	17.67	4.46	0.80NS	10.40	2.70	1.86NS
10.	Junagadh	19.68	4.62	2.58*	10.55	3.42	2.56*	19.48	4.77	1.10NS	14.13	4.13	1.92NS	17.90	4.10	1.59NS	16.88	3.79	3.99**	11.78	3.30	0.09NS
11.	Kaira	20.79	4.28	2.11*	12.16	3.36	3.68**	20.42	4.57	0.98NS	15.50	3.71	0.50NS	19.33	5.06	0.98NS	19.99	4.31	0.40NS	11.83	3.39	0.49NS
12.	Kutch-Bhuj	22.85	1.76	2.37*	15.60	5.63	4.09**	21.45	2.33	1.72NS	15.05	3.56	0.86NS	18.15	4.21	0.50NS	20.40	3.52	2.10*	11.45	1.54	0.00NS
13.	Mehsana	20.64	4.10	2.20*	12.03	3.01	1.36NS	19.73	4.34	1.27NS	14.24	3.91	2.18*	18.65	4.04	2.78**	15.30	4.17	4.15**	11.45	3.34	0.15NS
14.	Panchmahals	21.95	2.72	2.70**	12.68	2.81	1.96NS	20.60	3.90	0.89NS	15.60	3.67	1.57NS	20.42	3.65	3.19**	21.17	4.32	4.50**	11.53	3.34	0.16NS
15.	Rajkot	20.10	4.56	2.27*	11.60	3.23	1.80NS	19.92	4.52	0.84NS	14.58	3.41	2.04*	18.25	3.79	1.44NS	17.82	3.63	2.12*	11.62	2.32	0.98NS
16.	Sabarkantha	21.66	2.70	0.16NS	12.51	2.18	0.93NS	20.58	3.98	1.32NS	15.87	3.46	1.11NS	19.27	3.96	1.96NS	19.29	3.94	1.08NS	12.10	3.03	0.48NS
17.	Surendranagar	21.57	2.64	0.60NS	12.93	1.74	1.12NS	21.67	3.01	1.1 NS	16,73	3,53	1.37NS	21.00	3.90	0.45NS	20.27	4.21	1.00NS	12.43	3.17	0.22NS
18.	Surat	21.18	2.99	0.31NS	12.50	1.73	0.72NS	20.87	3.39	1.49NS	15.53	3.85	0.86NS	20.63	3.58	2.88**	19.40	3.71	0.74NS	12.28	2.99	0.95NS
19.	Valsad	21.36	3.39		12.21	2.62		19.94	3.93		16.80	10.41		18.74	3.86		19.93	4.33		11.80	2.81	

** Highly Significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not Significant

is in favour of Amreli district, Banaskantha district, Kaira district, Kutch-Bhuj district, again Kutch-Bhuj district, Panchmahal district, Sabarkantha district respectively.

The rest of the values are not significant. Amreli district gives the highest mean and Dang gives the lowest mean in the case of Individualization.

Curriculum Organisation :

From the same Table, it appears that in the case of Curriculum Organisation some of the values are highly significant, one value is significant, and many values are not significant.

So far as Curriculum Organisation is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Banaskantha district and Baroda district, Kaira district and Kutch-Bhuj district, Kutch-Bhuj district and Mehsana district at 0.01 level and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, Kutch-Bhuj district and again Kutch-Bhuj district respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district.

The rest of the values are insignificant. Kutch-Bhuj gives the highest mean and Dang the lowest in the case of Curriculum Organization along with Bhavnagar and Junagadh districts.

Teaching-Learning Process :

From this Table, we can see that all values are insignificant in this component.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat, Surendranagar district gives the highest mean in the case of Teaching-Learning Process. Dang district gives the smallest mean in the case of Teaching-Learning Process.

Teaching Sources :

From this Table, we see that there is no highly significant value and some values are significant and many values are insignificant in the case of Teaching Resources.

So far as Teaching Resources are concerned, there is a significant mean difference between Gandhinagar district and Jamnagar district, Mehsana district and Panchmahal district, Rajkot and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Gandhinagar district ; Panchmahal district, and Sabarkantha district respectively.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

Amreli gives the highest mean and Jamnagar and lowest mean in the case of Teaching Resources.

Internal School Organisation :

From this Table, it appears that in the case of this component, some values are highly significant, one value is significant and many values are insignificant.

So far as the Internal School Organization is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Mehsana district and Panchmahal district. Panchmahal district and Rajkot district, Surat district and Valsad district at 0.01 level and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Panchmahal district, again Panchmahal district and Surat district respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Dang district and Gandhinagar district at 0.05 level and the mean difference is in favour of Gandhinagar district.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

Surendranagar gives the highest and Dang gives the lowest mean on Internal School Organization.

Staff Development :

From this Table, it appears that some of the values are highly significant, some of the values are significant and some of the values are insignificant.

So far as Staff Development is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Banaskantha district and Baroda district, Junagadh district and Kaira district, Mehsana district and Panchmahal district, Panchmahal district and Rajkot district at 0.01 level, and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, Kaira district, Panchmahal district, and again Panchmahal district respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Dang district and Gandhinagar district, Kutch-Bhuj district and Mehsana district, Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district, at 0.05 level and the significant mean difference is in favour of Gandhinagar district, Kutch-Bhuj district, and Sabarkantha district respectively.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

Banaskantha possesses the highest while Dang the lowest mean on Staff Development.

School Community Relationship :

From this Table, it can be seen that no value is highly significant and two values are significant and many values are insignificant in the case of School Community Relationship.

So far as School Community Relationship is concerned there is a significant mean difference between Banaskantha district and Baroda district, Bhavnagar district and Broach district at.0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, and Bhavnagar district respectively. The rest of the values are insignificant.

In all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Amreli district gives the highest mean and Broach district possesses the lowest mean in the case of School Community Relationship. However, Banaskantha district touches Amreli district and Dang touches the Broach district.

5.2.3 Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics in the Various Districts of Gujarat

TABLE 5.4

1. Administrative Support :

From this Table 5.4, it appears that some of the values are highly significant and some of them are significant and many values are insignificant.in the case of Administrative Support.

So far as the Administrative Support is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Junagadh and Kaira districts at 0.01 level and the significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district. To interpret it further it can be said that Kaira district gives more Administrative Support to teachers than Junagadh district for them to become more prone to innovations.

Again between Kaira district and Kutch-Bhuj district is concerned in the case of Administrative Support, the mean difference is significant at 0.05 level, and in favour of Kaira district. Further between Surendranagar and Surat districts the significant mean difference at 0.5

Table :5.4: Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics in Various Districts of Gujarat

Sr. No.	Districts	Administrative Support 1			Staff Norms 2			System Norms 3			Complexity 4			Compatibility 5			Riskness 6			Localiteness 7			Cosmopoliteness 8		
		Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1.	Ahmedabad	25.68	8.77	0.57NS	31.75	1.18	0.94NS	16.80	8.99	1.24NS	23.89	4.32	1.36NS	23,54	4.29	0.81NS	32.03	6.52	2.04*	33.32	6.35	0.17NS	17.70	7.60	2.74**
2.	Amreli	26.85	5.56	0.68NS	27.70	13.82	1.85NS	14.20	6.13	0.33NS	22.35	6.10	0.86NS	24.35	2.76	0.00NS	35.25	5.95	1.12NS	33.05	6.30	1.45NS	12.75	6.07	2.35*
3.	Banaskantha	28.10	6.14	0.88NS	36.10	14.85	0.10NS	14.95	8.28	0.58NS	23.95	5.73	1.46NS	24.35	3.13	1.95NS	35.05	3.30	4.21**	35.50	4.17	2.65**	17.65	7.07	0.86NS
4.	Baroda	26.87	7.57	0.88NS	36.02	12.50	0.10NS	17.48	6.81	0.58NS	21.63	4.86	1.46NS	22.18	4.78	2.02*	30.59	6 58	0.97NS	31.20	6.99	0.76NS	19.10	6.89	1.54NS
5.	Bhavnagar	25.70	5.92	0.51NS	36.23	11.45	0.69NS	16.75	6.34	1.95NS	20.28	5.20	1.04NS	20.23	6.08	0.92NS	29.35	7.42	0.57NS	30.20	7.04	0.86NS	17.13	6.79	0.62NS
6.	Broach	26.53	7.91	0.61NS	36.13	11.33	0.59NS	19.70	6.18	0.72NS	21 47	4.04	1.94NS	21.43	4.45	1.26NS	30.43	5.59	2.70**	28.80	6.28	2.13*	18.17	7.10	0.20NS
7.	Dang	24.90	5.20	0.63NS	36.70	11.05	0.40NS	18.20	3.88	0.57NS	18.20	6.09	1.37NS	19.20	5.94	1.10NS	25.10	4.80	2.52*	24.40	2.96	3.39**	17.70	2.91	0.02NS
8.	Gandhinagar	26.32	6.73	0.12NS	33.78	14.35	0.39NS	16.76	7.71	0.10NS	20.72	5.16	0.99NS	21.46	6.13	0.79NS	31.12	7.21	0.67NS	32.20	7.12	0.97NS	17.66	6.92	0.37NS
9.	Jamnagar	26.13	7.45	0.44NS	32.57	11.66	1.10NS	16.60	6.25	0.10NS	21.90	8.18	1.30NS	22.63	6.91	1.85NS	32.23	7.09	1.64NS	33.70	5.86	2.21*	18.27	7.66	0.67NS
10.	Junagadh	25.45	5.59	3.06**	36.73	13.12	0.15NS	16.75	6.34	1.33NS	20.28	5.20	2.55*	20.23	6.08	3.49**	29.35	7.42	2.87*	30.20	7.04	2.27*	17.13	6.49	1.30NS
11.	Kaira	29.33	7.21	2.57*	36.21	15.51	2.26*	18.55	7.53	1.49NS	22.77	5.24	1.79NS	23.68	4.94	1.26NS	32.69	7.05	1.04NS	33.30	7.40	0.62NS	18.98	8.02	1.58NS
12.	Kutch-Bhuj	24.90	6.05	1.14NS	27.60	15.74	2.34*	15.85	6.75	0.63NS	20.45	5.53	0.84NS	22.15	4.98	0.16NS	34.45	6.25	1.58NS	34.45	8.26	1.62NS	16.10	3.23	0.46NS
13.	Mehsana	26.61	6.15	0.33NS	35.23	12.83	0.82NS	16.85	6.39	0.44NS	21.54	5.25	0.87NS	21.93	5.65	0.57NS	31.89	6.68	1.73NS	31.69	6.69	1.03NS	16.80	6.64	0.71NS
14.	Panchmahals	27.03	10.02	0.56NS	33.23	17.88	0.10NS	16.32	8.96	0.75NS	23.35	6.39	1.58NS	22.47	6.02	0.54NS	33.90	7.79	1.78NS	32.87	7.47	0.91NS	17.68	9.01	1.23NS
15.	Rajkot	26.20	5.73	1.39NS	33.52	11.14	1.90NS	15.25	6.33	0.31NS	20.65	5.33	1.95NS	21.88	5.84	1.35NS	31.50	6.97	2.35*	31.67	6.98	2.38*	15.92	6.50	0.35NS
16.	Sabarkantha	27.75	6.38	1.49NS	29.24	13.35	0.25NS	14.86	7.34	1.26NS	22.70	6.08	1.12NS	23.32	5.76	0.82NS	34.25	5.77	1.04NS	34.51	6.02	1.81NS	16.36	7.34	1.36NS
17.	Surendranagar	30.10	8.19	2.07*	28.43	16.33	0.70NS	16.93	7.31	0.26NS	24.27	6.63	0.86NS	24.40	6.16	0.49NS	35.60	5.77	1.49NS	36.70	3.92	1.84NS	18.50	6.43	0.92NS
18.	Surat	26.48	7.60	1.75NS	30.92	15.56	1.61NS	16.52	7.23	1.20NS	23.07	6.05	1.33NS	23.75	5.88	2.14*	33.58	6.20	1.53NS	34.57	5.72	1.30NS	17.22	6.11	1.03NS
19.	Valsad	28.79	7.40		35.13	14.29		18.01	7.03		21.79	6.73		21.57	5.70		31.69	7.69		33.17	6.45		18.40	6.91	

** Highly significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not significant

level is in favour of Surendranagar district. However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat, Surendranagar district gives the highest mean in the case of Administrative Support. Rest of the mean differences in the case of Administrative Support are insignificant.

Dang and Kutch-Bhuj districts possess the lowest mean on Administrative Support.

2. Staff Norms :

This Table shows that two values are significant, and rest of the values are insignificant in the case of 'Staff Norms'

So far as the 'Staff Norms' is concerned there is a significant mean difference between Kaira and Kutch-Bhuj at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district. Further we see that there is a significant mean difference between Kutch-Bhuj district and Mehsana district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Mehsana district.

To interpret it further it can be said that Kaira district gives higher Staff Norms than what Kutch-Bhuj district does. Similarly Mehsana district supports more Staff Norms than Kutch-Bhuj district.

Rest of the mean differences in the case of Staff Norms are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen district of Gujarat State, Broach district gives the highest mean in the case of Staff Norms. Kutch-Bhuj district possesses the lowest mean on Staff Norms.

3. System Norms :

From this Table, it appears that all values are insignificant in the case of System Norms.

However, in all nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Broach district gives the highest mean and Amreli district possesses the lowest mean on System Norms.

4. Complexity :

In this case from the Table, it appears that one of the values is significant. The rest of the values are insignificant.

So far as the 'Complexity' is concerned there is a significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.05 level, and the mean difference is in favour of Kaira district.

The rest of the values are insignificant. However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat Surendranagar district gives the highest mean in the case of Complexity

and Dang district possesses the lowest mean on Complexity.

5. Compatibility :

In this case from the same Table, it can be seen that one value is highly significant and two values are significant. The rest of the values are insignificant.

So far as the Compatibility is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.01 level and highly significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district. Further we see that there is significant mean difference between Baroda district and Bhavnagar district at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Baroda district. Similarly there is significant mean difference between Surat district and Valsad district at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Surat district. To interpret it further, it can be said that Kaira district teachers have more Compatibility than Junagadh district teachers. Similarly Baroda district teachers give more Compatibility than what Bhavnagar district teachers do and Surat district teachers give more Compatibility than what Valsad district teachers do. The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all districts of Gujarat State Surendranagar district gives the highest mean in the case of Compatability. Dang district possesses the lowest mean.

6. Riskness :

From the Table, it appears that some of the values are highly significant, some of the values are significant and the rest of the values are insignificant.in the case of 'Riskness'.

So far as the Riskness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Banaskantha district and Baroda district at 0.01 level and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district. Similarly there is highly significant mean difference between Broach district and Dang district at 0.01 level and highly significant mean difference is in favour of Broach district.

There is a significant mean difference between Ahmedabad district and Amreli district at 0.05 level and the significant mean difference is in favour of Amreli district. There is a significant mean difference between Dang district and Gandhinagar district at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Gandhinagar district. There is a significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Kaira district. There is a significant mean

difference between Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Sabarkantha district.

The rest of the values are insignificant. However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State Banaskantha district has given the highest mean in the case of Riskness, and Dang district possesses the lowest mean on Riskness.

7. Localiteness :

From the same Table, it appears that some values are highly significant and some values are significant and some values are insignificant in the case of Localiteness.

So far as Localiteness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Banaskantha district and Baroda district at 0.01 level and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district. There is highly significant mean difference between Dang district and Gandhinagar district at 0.01 level and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Gandhinagar district.

There is a significant mean difference between Broach district and Dang district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Broach district.

There is a significant mean difference between Jamnagar district and Junagadh district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Jamnagar district. There is a significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district. There is a significant mean difference between Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of Sabarkantha district.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all nineteen districts of Gujarat State Surendranagar district gives the highest mean in the case of Localiteness, and Dang district possesses the lowest mean.

8. Cosmopoliteness :

From the same Table, it appears that one value is highly significant and the rest of the values are insignificant in the case of 'Cosmopoliteness'.

So far as Cosmopoliteness is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Ahmedabad district and Amreli district at 0.01 level and the highly

significant mean difference is in favour of Ahmedabad district.

There is significant mean difference between Amreli district and Banaskantha district at 0.05 level and the significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district.

The rest of the values are insignificant in the case of Cosmopoliteness.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State,Baroda district gives the highest mean in the case of Cosmopoliteness, and Amreli district possesses the lowest mean.

5.2.4 Components of Change Related Values in Gujarat State

TABLE 5.5

1. Traditionalism :

In this case,from the Table No. 5.5, it appears that some values are highly significant, and many values are insignificant.

So far as the Traditionalism is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Banaskantha

Table :5.5: Components of Change Related Values in Gujarat

Districts	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism			Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
1. Ahmedabad	39.36	6.64		39.75	6.06		35.28	8.05		34.96	7.35		32.61	8.28		46.61	6.04	
			1.67 NS			1.85 NS			1.80 NS			0.08 NS			4.11**			3.64**
2. Amreli	42.00	5.31		42.90	10.48		31.60	9.85		35.10	7.32		24.30	8.06		46.70	3.47	
			0.94 NS			0.83 NS			2.63*			1.09 NS			2.62*			0.80 NS
3. Banaskantha	43.50	4.80		40.65	6.11		38.40	6.04		37.45	6.32		31.35	8.94		45.80	3.65	
			2.94 **			0.13 NS			2.41 *			1.77 NS			0.10 NS			2.62 **
4. Baroda	33.88	6.67		40.45	6.06		33.81	8.07		34.16	7.80		31.54	5.57		41.28	7.52	
			1.24 NS			3.47 **			1.36 NS			2.07 *			1.25 NS			2.50 **
5. Bhavnagar	36.95	6.80		36.20	7.64		31.65	9.48		31.20	7.18		33.35	8.88		37.48	9.53	
			0.16 NS			0.50 NS			0.36 NS			0.84 NS			1.39 NS			0.63 NS
6. Broach	37.20	5.90		37.03	5.89		32.40	7.49		32.60	6.56		30.70	7.89		38.80	7.60	
			0.59 NS			1.76 NS			1.33 NS			1.72 NS			0.44 NS			3.40 **
7. Dang	36.00	4.14		33.40	4.76		29.00	5.08		28.60	5.64		31.90	5.67		29.90	5.55	
			0.15 NS			1.22 NS			0.85 NS			1.41 NS			0.28 NS			2.60 *
8. Gandhinagar	35.55	8.51		36.60	7.95		31.54	9.35		32.24	7.77		32.72	8.97		38.28	9.61	
			3.30 **			2.02 *			0.08 NS			0.76 NS			1.15 NS			1.80 NS
9. Jamnagar	41.50	6.20		39.90	5.28		31.70	8.69		33.50	5.31		30.37	8.67		41.93	6.67	
			2.88 **			2.41 *			0.11 NS			1.48 NS			1.50 NS			2.03 *
10. Junagadh	36.95	6.80		35.95	7.74		31.73	9.57		31.20	7.18		33.55	8.88		37.73	9.76	
			1.47 NS			2.96 **			1.12 NS			2.85 **			0.94 NS			3.12 **
11. Kaira	38.93	7.36		40.21	7.72		33.57	8.50		35.70	8.87		31.96	9.17		42.48	7.41	
			0.05 NS			0.17 NS			0.29 NS			1.21 NS			2.64 **			0.83 NS
12. Kutch-Bhuj	37.95	7.00		39.90	7.15		32.95	10.57		33.05	9.40		26.35	5.27		43.95	5.99	
			0.38 NS			0.99 NS			0.33 NS			0.65 NS			2.72 **			1.72 NS
13. Mehsana	38.58	6.77		38.12	7.42		32.21	8.90		31.81	7.48		31.61	8.31		40.50	8.59	
			0.21 NS			1.52 NS			0.17 NS			0.30 NS			1.88 NS			1.23 NS
14. Panchmahals	38.85	9.63		40.13	9.17		32.47	9.62		32.22	9.93		28.77	10.63		42.23	8.69	
			1.33 NS			1.74 NS			0.91 NS			1.06 NS			1.48 NS			1.71 NS
15. Rajkot	36.87	6.36		37.50	7.26		30.98	8.16		30.53	7.36		31.32	8.02		39.45	9.17	
			2.80 **			1.74 NS			0.18 NS			1.01 NS			2.28 *			2.48 *
16. Sabarkantha	40.05	6.06		39.71	6.59		30.70	8.89		31.81	6.38		27.59	9.69		43.03	6.34	
			1.11 NS			1.62 NS			0.57 NS			0.94 NS			0.24 NS			0.61 NS
17. Surendranagar	41.47	4.93		42.07	6.32		29.47	11.09		33.17	6.47		28.13	11.03		43.87	5.66	
			0.66 NS			1.24 NS			0.29 NS			0.24 NS			0.44 NS			0.31 NS
18. Surat	40.58	6.46		40.50	5.28		30.13	9.73		33.55	7.26		29.15	10.03		44.27	5.78	
			1.21 NS			0.40 NS			1.25 NS			0.02 NS			1.10 NS			1.38 NS
19. Valsad	39.07	7.62		40.04	7.31		32.33	10.14		33.53	7.38		30.97	8.79		42.53	8.18	

** Highly significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not Significant

district and Baroda district, Gandhinagar district and Jamnagar district, Jamnagar district and Junagadh district, Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.01 level and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, Jamnagar district, again Jamnagar district and Sabarkantha district, respectively.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Banaskantha district gives the highest mean in case of Traditionalism. Baroda district possesses the lowest mean on Traditionalism.

2. Progressivism :

From the same Table, it appears that some values are highly significant, some values are significant, many values are insignificant in Progressivism.

So far as Progressivism is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Baroda district and Bhavnagar district, Junagadh district and Kaira district, at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Baroda district and Kaira

district respectively. There is significant mean difference between Gandhinagar district and Jamnagar district, Jamnagar district and Junagadh district at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Jamnagar district in both cases.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State Amreli district possesses the highest mean in the case of Progressivism. Dang district possesses the lowest mean in all the districts of Gujarat State in the case of Progressivism.

3. Dogmatism :

From the Table, it appears that no value is highly significant, two values are significant and many values are insignificant in the case of Dogmatism.

So far as the Dogmatism is concerned there is a significant mean difference between Amreli district and Banaskantha district, Banaskantha district and Baroda district at 0.05 level, the mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district in both the cases.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Banaskantha district possesses highest mean in the

case of Dogmatism. Dang district possesses the lowest mean in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State in the case of Dogmatism.

4. Venturesomeness :

From the Table, it can be seen that one value is highly significant, one is significant and many values are insignificant in the case of Venturesomeness.

So far as Venturesomeness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Junagadh district and Kaira district at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Kaira district.

There is a significant mean difference between Baroda district and Bhavnagar district at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Baroda district. The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Banaskantha district possesses the highest mean in the case of Venturesomeness. Dang district possesses the lowest mean in the case of Venturesomeness in all the districts of Gujarat State.

5. Conservatism :

From the Table, it appears that some values are highly significant. Some values are significant and many values are insignificant in the case of Conservatism.

So far as the Conservatism is concerned, the highly significant mean difference is between Ahmedabad district and Amreli district, Kaira district and Kutch-Bhuj district, Kutch-Bhuj district and Mehsana district at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Ahmedabad district, Kaira district, and Mehsana district respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Amreli district and Banaskantha district, Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level and the significant mean difference is in favour of Banaskantha district, and Rajkot district respectively.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State, Junagadh district and Bhavnagar district possess the highest mean in the case of Conservatism. Amreli district possesses the lowest mean in all the districts of Gujarat State in the case of Conservatism.

6. Change Proneness :

This Table also shows that some values are highly insignificant, some values are significant and many values are insignificant in the case of Change Proneness.

So far as the Change Proneness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Ahmedabad district and Amreli district, Banaskantha district and Baroda district, Baroda district and Bhavnagar district and Bhavnagar and Broach district, Broach district and Dang district, Junagadh district and Kaira district, at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Amreli district, Banaskantha district, Baroda district, Broach district, again Broach and Kaira district respectively.

There is significant mean difference between Dang district and Gandhinagar district, Jamnagar district and Junagadh district, Rajkot district and Sabarkantha district at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Gandhinagar district, Jamnagar district ; and Sabarkantha district respectively.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

However, in all the nineteen districts, Amreli district possesses highest mean in the case of Change Proneness. Dang district possesses the lowest mean in the case of Change Proneness in all the nineteen districts of Gujarat State.

5.3.1 Sex Types of Schools and Innovative Proneness of Teachers

The Table 5.6 below shows the number and percentage of sampled teachers according to the sex types of schools. This table shows that there are one thousand teachers, out of them one hundred teachers are from Boys schools, two hundred and twenty teachers from girls schools and six hundred and eighty teachers from mixed schools. There are 10 %, 22 % and 68 % teachers from Boys, Girls and Mixed schools respectively.

Table :5.6: Number and Percentage of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools according to Types of Schools

Sex Type of Schools	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers
Boys'	100	10.0
Girls'	220	22.0
Mixed	680	68.0
Total	1000	100.0

Mean difference is computed according to the three sections of the Innovative Proneness Scale and also according to its twenty one components.

5.3.2 Attitudes to Innovation, Situational and Innovation Characteristics, Change Related Values, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole in Various Sex-Type Schools

Table 5.7

1. Attitudes to Innovation :

The Table 5.7 shows that all values are highly significant in the case of Attitudes to Innovation.

So far as Attitude to Innovation is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, and the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools and Girls' schools respectively from pairs comparison point of view.

In all the three types of schools, Girls' schools give the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Attitudes to Innovation.

2. The Situational and Innovation Characteristics :

From the Table, it appears that no value is highly significant, one value is significant and two values are not significant in the case of Situational and Innovation Characteristics.

Table :5.7: Attitudes to Innovations, Situational and Innovation Characteristics and Change Related Values in Various Sex Types of Schools

	Section I			Section II			Section III			As a whole		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Boys	100.04	21.08		197.40	31.41		188.17	33.05		485.70	73.43	
			11.62**			0.84 NS			8.90**			7.94**
Girls	125.60	16.80		201.04	37.93		326.85	36.48		553.57	69.67	
Boys	100.04	21.08		197.40	31.41		188.17	35.05		485.70	73.43	
			7.74**			2.12*			7.78**			6.5 **
Mixed	117.32	20.83		206.83	42.73		217.69	35.50		541.64	81.01	
Girls	125.60	16.80		201.04	37.93		226.85	36.48		553.57	69.67	
			5.36**			1.80 NS			3.30**			1.96 *
Mixed	117.32	20.83		206.83	42.73		217.89	35.50		541.64	81.01	

** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not Significant

So far as the Situational and Innovation Characteristics are concerned there is a significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Mixed schools at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Mixed schools.

The rest of the two values are not significant.

In all three types of schools, Mixed schools give the highest mean and Boys' schools give lowest mean in the case of the Situational and Innovation Characteristics.

3. The Change Related Values :

From the Table, it appears that all values are highly significant and one value is significant in the case of change Related Values.

So far as the Change Related values are concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, and Mixed schools and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools, Girls' Schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of the Change Related Values.

as a Whole
Innovative Proneness : Different Sex Types of Schools

So far as the general mean of the Innovative Proneness score is concerned, the mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools is significant at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, and Mixed schools respectively.

There is significant mean difference between Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.05 level. The mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools.

However, in all the three types of schools, Girls' schools possess the highest mean (553.57) and Boys schools possess the lowest mean (485.70). The overall mean is 526.99.

5.3.3 Components of Attitudes to Innovation and Sex Types of the Schools

TABLE 5.8

1. Individualization :

From Table No. 5.8, it appears that all the values are highly significant.

So far as Individualization is concerned there is a highly significant mean difference at 0.01 level between Boys'

TABLE : 5.8 : Components of Attitudes to Innovation and Sex Types of the Schools

	Individualization 1			Curriculum Organization 2			Teaching-Learning Process 3			Teaching Resources 4		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. Boys	16.88	5.16		10.04	2.98		16.72	4.43		13.38	3.39	
			11.97**			10.54**			11.27**			3.78**
2. Girls	22.25	2.84		13.41	2.48		21.93	3.53		16.08	6.76	
3. Boys	16.88	5.16		10.04	2.98		16.72	4.43		13.38	3.39	
			8.87**			5.74**			7.80**			4.33**
4. Mixed	20.64	3.75		11.94	3.11		20.10	3.99		15.12	3.80	
5. Girls	22.25	2.84		13.41	2.48		21.93	3.53		16.08	6.76	
			5.87**			6.35**			6.06**			2.63**
6. Mixed	20.64	3.75		11.94	3.11		20.10	3.99		15.12	3.80	

	Internal School Organization 5			Staff Development 6			School Community Relationship 7		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. Boys	17.00	3.97		17.02	3.39		9.85	2.54	
			6.52**			6.07**			7.98**
2. Girls	20.13	3.93		19.78	3.92		12.53	2.89	
3. Boys	17.00	3.97		17.02	3.39		9.85	2.54	
			3.51**			4.23**			5.65**
4. Mixed	18.63	4.38		19.04	4.60		11.69	3.10	
5. Girls	20.13	3.98		19.78	3.92		12.53	2.89	
			4.51**			2.14*			3.56**
6. Mixed	18.63	4.38		19.04	4.60		11.69	3.10	

Note: ** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significanc

schools and Girls' schools; Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Mixed schools and Girls' schools. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools, and Girls' schools, respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the smallest mean in the case of Individualisation.

2. Curriculum Organisation :

The Table 5.8 shows that all values are highly significant. in the case of 'Curriculum Organisation'.

So far as Curriculum Organization is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools give the highest mean and Boys' schools give the lowest mean in the case of Curriculum Organization.

3. Teaching-Learning Process :

From the Table, it appears that all values are highly significant in Teaching-Learning Process.

So far as Teaching-Learning Process is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Teaching-Learning Process.

4. Teaching Resources :

From the Table, it appears that all the values are highly significant in the case of Teaching Resources.

So far as Teaching Resources are concerned, the highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and mixed schools at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools, and Girls' Schools respectively.

However, in all the types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools, possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Teaching Resources.

5. Internal School Organization :

From the Table, it appears that all the values are highly significant in this component.

So far as the Internal School Organisation is concerned there is a highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools, and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools give the highest mean and Boys' schools give the lowest mean in the case of Internal School Organization.

6. Staff Development :

This Table shows that two values are highly significant and one value is significant in the case of Staff Development.

So far as Staff Development is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, at 0.01

level, the highest mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, and Mixed schools respectively. There is significant mean difference between Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Staff Development.

7. School Community Relationship :

This Table shows that all values are highly significant. so far as School Community Relationship is concerned. There is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools, at 0.01 level, the highest mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools, and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools give the highest mean and Boys' schools the lowest in the case of School Community Relationship.

5.3.4 Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics in Various Sex Types of Schools

TABLE 5.9

1. Administrative Support :

From the Table 5.9, it appears that one value is highly significant, one value is significant and one value is not significant in this component.

So far as the Administrative Support is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' and Girls' schools, at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools. There is significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Mixed schools at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Mixed schools.

One value is not significant.

However, in all the types of schools in Gujarat State, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Administrative Support.

Table :5.9: Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics in Various Sex Types Schools

	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-Value	Mean	SD	t-value
Boys	25.34	5.88	2.85**	36.63	10.64	5.06**	17.76	4.77	3.51**	20.52	4.26	3.01**
Girls	27.59	6.81		28.48	14.41		14.91	7.45		22.30	5.18	
Boys	25.34	5.85	2.16*	35.63	10.64	1.07 NS	17.76	4.77	0.51 NS	20.52	4.26	2.76**
Mixed	27.06	7.66		35.01	14.64		17.37	7.45		22.18	5.80	
Girls	27.59	6.81	0.91 NS	28.48	14.41	5.78**	14.91	7.45	4.26**	22.30	5.18	0.28 NS
Mixed	27.06	7.66		35.01	14.64		17.37	7.45		22.18	5.80	

	Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Boys	21.16	5.24	2.95**	29.60	6.41	5.95	28.87	7.92	7.11**	17.22	4.19	1.48 NS
Girls	23.02	5.20		34.00	6.01		34.52	5.90		15.66	7.98	
Boys	21.16	5.24	2.56*	29.60	6.41	3.11**	28.87	7.92	4.98**	17.22	4.19	1.46 NS
Mixed	22.51	5.61		31.94	7.12		32.53	6.70		18.27	7.04	
Girls	23.02	5.20	1.20 NS	34.00	6.01	3.86**	34.52	5.90	3.94**	16.66	7.98	4.63**
Mixed	22.51	5.61		31:94	7:12		32.53	6:70		18.27	7.04	

** Highly significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not Significant

2. Staff Norms :

This Table shows that two values are highly significant and one value is not significant in the case of Staff Norms.

So far as the Staff Norms are concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Boys' schools and Mixed schools respectively.

One value is not significant.

However, in all the three types of schools, Boys' schools possess the highest mean and Girls' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Staff Norms.

3. System Norms :

From the Table, it appears that the two values are highly significant one value is not significant in the case of System Norms.

So far as System Norms are concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level and mean difference is in favour of Boys' schools and Mixed schools respectively.

One value is not significant.

However, in all the three types of schools, Boys' schools possess the highest mean and Girls' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of System Norms.

4. Complexity :

From the Table, it appears that in this case two values are highly significant and one value is not significant.

So far as Complexity is concerned the highly significant mean difference is between Boys schools and Girls schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools and Mixed schools respectively.

One value is not significant.

However, in all the three types of schools, Girls' schools possess the highest mean difference and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean difference in the case of Complexity.

5. Compatibility :

There is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools at 0.01 level and significant mean difference between Boys schools and Mixed schools at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools and Mixed schools respectively.

6. Riskness :

From the same Table, it can be seen that all the values are highly significant in Riskness.

So far as Riskness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools. Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools and Girls' schools respectively.

In all the three types of schools, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Riskness.

7. Localiteness :

From the Table, it can be found that all the values are highly significant in the case of Localiteness.

As far as Localiteness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of girls schools, Mixed schools, and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Localitness.

8. Cosmopoliteness :

From Table, it appears that one value is highly significant and two values are not significant. in this component.

So far as Cosmopoliteness is concerned the highly significant mean difference between Girls' schools and Mixed schools is at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Mixed schools.

The rest of the two values are not significant.

In all the three types of schools, Mixed schools possess the highest mean and Girls' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Cosmopoliteness.

5.3.5 Components of Change Related Values in Various Sex Types of Schools

TABLE 5.10

1. Traditionalism :

From the Table 5.10, it appears that two values are highly significant and one value is insignificant. in the case of Traditionalism.

TABLE : 5.10 : Components of Change Related Values in Various Sex Types of Schools

	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism			Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
Boys	32.64	8.20		32.99	7.39		27.92	7.93		30.15	8.36		28.68	7.69		35.16	8.90	
			8.13**			10.84**			5.63**			2.91**			2.08*			9.76**
Girls	39.41	6.23		42.40	7.11		33.49	8.32		32.96	7.82		30.77	8.60		43.97	6.74	
Boys	32.64	8.20		32.99	7.39		27.92	7.93		30.15	8.36		28.68	7.69		35.16	8.90	
			9.42**			8.52**			5.08**			4.37**			2.68**			7.51**
Mixed	36.59	6.68		39.11	6.61		32.85	9.21		33.72	7.52		31.30	9.31		41.48	7.69	
Girls	39.41	6.23		42.40	7.11		33.49	8.32		32.96	7.82		30.77	8.60		43.97	6.47	
			0.37 NS			6.29**			0.92 NS			1.30 NS			0.75 NS			4.29**
Mixed	36.59	6.68		39.11	6.61		32.85	9.21		33.72	7.52		31.30	9.31		41.48	7.69	

Note: ** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

So far as Traditionalism is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, and highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls schools and Mixed schools respectively.

One value is not significant. Mean difference is in favour of Mixed schools.

Mixed schools possess the highest mean in all the three types in the case of Traditionalism. Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in all the three types of schools in the case of Traditionalism.

2. Progressivism :

From the Table, it appears that all values are highly significant. in the case of Progressivism.

So far as Progressivism is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools. Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools, at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Progressivism.

3. Dogmatism :

From the Table, it appears that there are two values highly significant, one value insignificant in Dogmatism.

So far as Dogmatism is concerned the highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools and Boys' schools and Mixed schools is at 0.01 level, the mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools and Mixed schools respectively.

Mean difference between Girls' schools and Mixed schools is not significant.

In all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess lowest mean in the case of Dogmatism.

4. Venturesomeness :

From the Table, it appears that two values are highly significant and one value is not significant in the case of venturesomeness.

So far as Venturesomeness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and

Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls schools and Mixed schools respectively.

One value is not significant.

However, in all the three types of schools, Mixed schools possess the highest mean difference and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in the case of Venturesomeness.

5. Conservatism :

In this case from the Table, it is found that one value is highly significant, one value is significant and one value is not significant.

So far as Conservatism is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the mean difference is in favour of mixed schools.

There is significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools at 0.05 level, the mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools.

However, Mixed schools possess the highest mean and Boys' schools possess the lowest mean in all the three types of schools in case of Conservatism.

6. Change Proneness :

This Table shows that all value's are highly significant in the case of Change Proneness.

So far as Change Proneness is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Boys' schools and Girls' schools, Boys' schools and Mixed schools, Girls' schools and Mixed schools at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Girls' schools, Mixed schools, and Girls' schools respectively.

However, in all the three types of schools of Gujarat State, Girls' schools give the highest mean and Boys' schools give lowest mean in the case of Change Proneness.

5.4 Stream Types of the Schools and Innovative Proneness of Teachers

Table :5.11: Streamwise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Stream	No. of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers
Arts	0	0
Science	0	0
Commerce	90	90.0
Arts-Science-Commerce	380	38.0
Arts-Science	10	1.0
Arts-Commerce	330	33.0
Commerce-Science	190	19.0
Total	1000	100.0

Table 5.11 shows the number and percentage of teachers according to the streams of schools.

There is no school having only Arts or only Science stream. In this sample, there are 90 teachers in Commerce Stream, 380 teachers in Arts-Science-Commerce stream; 10 teachers in Arts-Science stream, 330 teachers in Arts-Commerce stream ; 190, teachers in Commerce-Science stream and their percentages are 0 ; 0 ; 90 ; 38.0 ; 1.0 ; 33.0 ; 19.0 ; respectively.

5.4.1 Stream-Type of Schools and Attitude to Innovations, Situational and Innovation Characteristics and Change Related Values, Innovative Proneness as a Whole

TABLE 5.12

1. Attitude to Innovations :

Table 5.12 shows that all values are not significant. No school is there having only Arts stream or only Science stream.

So far as Attitudes to Innovation is concerned no value is significant.

However, in all the streams, Arts-Science possesses highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possess lowest mean in the case of Attitude to Innovations.

Table :5.12: Stream Type of the Schools and Attitudes to Innovative, Situational and and Innovation Characteristics, The Change Related Values and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Streams	Attitudes to Innovation			Situational and Innovation Characteristics			The Change Related Values			Innovative Proneness as a Whole		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
1. Arts												
2. Science												
3. Commerce	119.30	20.80		217.27	40.23		226.69	31.25		563.58	78.05	
			1.23 NS			3.78**			3.24**			3.82**
4. Arts,Science & Commerce	116.12	22.31		200.26	38.00		211.67	41.31		528.09	70.50	
			0.77 NS			1.70 NS			1.80 NS			1.15 NS
5. Arts and Science	121.60	15.60		179.70	21.57		197.80	13.53		499.10	38.88	
			0.50 NS			1.32 NS			1.88 NS			1.64 NS
6. Arts and Commerce	118.34	20.47		205.44	44.54		219.02	35.55		542.33	83.14	
			0.57 NS			0.46 NS			0.08 NS			0.20 NS
7. Commerce and Science	117.28	20.09		207.22	38.94		219.28	32.32		643.78	74.17	
			0.77 NS			1.99*			1.81 NS			2.05*
8. Commerce	119.30	20.89		217.27	40.23		226.69	31.25		563.58	78.05	

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not Significant

2. Situational and Innovation Characteristics :

This Table shows that one value is highly significant, one value is significant and three values are not significant in this case.

There is no school having only Arts stream or only Science stream.

So far as Situational and Innovation Characteristics are concerned, there is a highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce.

There is significant mean difference between Commerce-Science and Commerce at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce in the case of Situational and Innovation Characteristics.

3. Change Related Value :

This Table shows that there is one highly significant value and others are not significant in the case of Change Related Values.

So far as Change Related Values are concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams Commerce stream possesses the highest mean ~~dif~~ and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Change Related Values.

4. Innovative Proneness as a Whole :

This Table shows that one value is highly significant, one value is significant and three values are not significant. No schools have only Arts or only Science streams.

So far as Innovative Proneness as a whole is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce.

There is significant mean difference between Commerce-Science and Commerce at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, so far as Innovative Proneness as a Whole is concerned, in all the streams Commerce stream gives the highest mean and Arts-Science stream possesses the lowest mean.

5.4.2 Stream-Type of the Schools and Components of Attitude to Innovations

TABLE 5.13

1. Individualisation :

Table No. 5.13 shows that all values are not significant. There is not a single school having only Arts stream or only Science stream.in the case of Individualisation.

However, in all the streams of schools, Arts Science possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science Commerce possess the lowest mean in the case of Individualisation.

2. Curriculum Organization :

This Table shows that two values are significant and two values are not significant. No schools have only Arts stream or only Science stream.in the case of Curriculum Organisation.

So far as Curriculum Organization is concerned there is a significant mean difference between Arts Science Commerce and Arts Science ; Arts-Science and Arts-Commerce at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Arts-Science in both the cases. The rest of the t-values are not significant.

TABLE : 5.13 : Stream Type of the Schools and Components of Attitudes to Innovations

	Individualisation 1			Curriculum Organization 2			Teaching-Learning Process 3			Teaching Resources 4		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. Arts												
2. Science												
3. Commerce	20.90	3.69	1.77 NS	12.44	2.56	1.27 NS	20.01	3.70	0.04 NS	15.26	3.68	0.34 NS
4. Arts, Science and Commerce	20.01	4.40	1.83 NS	12.00	3.06	2.16*	20.03	4.48	1.10 NS	15.10	3.91	0.31 NS
5. Arts and Science	21.60	3.87	0.50 NS	14.10	1.20	2.04*	21.60	2.84	1.07 NS	15.30	5.70	0.11 NS
6. Arts and Commerce	21.01	3.67	0.10 NS	12.20	2.93	1.70 NS	20.26	3.93	0.06 NS	15.29	5.95	0.71 NS
7. Commerce and Science	20.95	3.69		11.71	3.69		20.23	4.20		14.96	3.65	

	Internal School Organization 5			Staff Development 6			School Community Relationship 7		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. Arts									
2. Science									
3. Commerce	19.50	4.40	1.51 NS	20.11	3.82	2.98**	11.97	2.52	0.74 NS
4. Arts, Science and Commerce	18.72	4.44	0.65 NS	18.58	4.51	1.53 NS	11.70	3.18	1.47 NS
5. Arts and Science	17.80	1.93	0.75 NS	20.80	5.43	1.21 NS	10.20	3.77	1.30 NS
6. Arts and Commerce	18.85	4.42	0.71 NS	19.08	4.42	0.00 NS	11.51	3.13	1.40 NS
7. Commerce and Science	18.57	4.05		19.09	4.28		11.91	2.99	

Note: ** Highly significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not significant

However, in all the streams of schools; Arts-Science possess the highest mean and Commerce-Science possess the lowest mean in the case of Curriculum Organisation.

3. Teaching-Learning Process :

This Table shows that in this case all the values are not significant. There is no school having only Arts, or only Science stream.

However, in all the streams of schools, Arts-Science stream possesses the highest mean and Commerce stream possesses the lowest mean in the case of Teaching-Learning Process.

4. Teaching Resources :

This Table shows that in this case all values are not significant. There is no school having only Arts or only Science stream.

However, in all the streams of schools, Arts-Science possesses the highest mean and Commerce-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Teaching Resources.

5. Internal School Organization :

This Table shows that all values are not significant in this case. There is no school having only Arts stream, or only Science stream.

However, in all the streams of schools, Commerce stream possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science stream possesses the lowest mean in the case of School Organisation.

6. Staff Development :

This Table shows that in this case, one value is highly significant. All other values are not significant. No school is there having only Arts stream or only Science stream.

So far as 'Staff Development' is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce stream and Arts-Science-Commerce stream at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce stream.

The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams Arts-Science possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possesses the lowest mean in the case of 'Staff Development'.

7. School Community Relationship :

This Table shows that all values are not significant in this case. There is no school having only Arts stream or only Science stream.

However, in all the streams, Commerce stream possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science stream possesses the lowest mean in the case of School Community Relationship.

5.4.3 Stream-Type of the Schools and the Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

TABLE 5.14

1. Administrative Support :

The Table No. 5.14 shows that one value is significant in this case and other values are not significant. No schools have only Arts or Science stream.

So far as Administrative Support is concerned, there is significant mean difference between Commerce stream and Arts-Science-Commerce stream at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce stream. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the types of stream Commerce stream possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science stream possesses the lowest mean in the case of Administrative Support.

Table :5.14: Stream-Type of the Schools and Components of the Situational Innovation Characteristics

Streams	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity			Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. Arts																								
2. Science																								
3. Commerce	28.14	7.71		37.21	14.14		19.10	7.76		22.81	5.24		24.11	3.95		33.36	5.90		35.74	5.83		18.75	6.25	
			2.04*			2.61**			3.60**			1.80NS			3.72**			2.09*			2.22*			1.41NS
4. Arts, Science and Commerce	26.56	6.46		32.72	14.80		16.07	7.05		21.71	5.46		21.86	5.40		31.72	6.87		31.96	7.05		17.70	6.42	
			1.64NS			3.81**			0.88NS			2.30*			0.26NS			1.18NS			1.67NS			4.62*
5. Arts and Science	23.10	10.70		14.80	9.25		14.10	5.76		25.70	1.49		22.30	0.82		34.30	4.03		35.70	4.37		8.20	6.13	
			1.63NS			3.95**			1.11NS			1.86NS			0.41NS			0.81NS			1.34NS			3.68*
6. Arts and Commerce	27.36	8.07		33.22	14.63		16.80	7.62		22.25	5.86		23.03	5.61		32.51	6.96		32.69	7.06		17.16	7.62	
			0.60NS			2.17*			1.30NS			0.98NS			1.94NS			1.15NS			0.51NS			1.32NS
7. Commerce and Science	26.94	7.18		36.01	13.03		17.66	6.77		21.75	5.36		22.01	6.07		31.76	7.42		33.01	6.34		18.07	7.59	

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

2. Staff Norms :

This Table shows that three values are highly significant and one value is significant in this case.

So far as 'Staff Norms' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts Science-Commerce, Arts-Science-Commerce and Arts-Science, Arts-Science and Arts Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce, Arts Science - Commerce, and Arts-Commerce respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Arts-Commerce and Commerce-Science at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce-Science stream.

However, in all the streams Commerce stream possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Staff Norms.

3. System Norms :

This Table shows that one value is highly significant and rest of the values are not significant in this case of System Norms.

As far as 'System Norms' is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference

is in favour of Commerce. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all streams Commerce stream possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean is in the case of System Norms.

4. Complexity :

This Table shows that one value is significant and three values are not significant in the case of Complexity.

So far as Complexity is concerned there is significant mean difference between Arts-Science-Commerce and Arts-Science at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Arts-Science stream, the rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams, Arts-Science possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possesses the lowest mean in the case of Complexity.

5. Compatibility :

This Table shows that one value is highly significant, and three values are not significant in the case of compatibility.

So far as Compatibility is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-

Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce, the rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams, Commerce possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possesses the lowest mean in the case of Compatibility.

6. Riskness :

This Table shows that one value is significant and three values are not significant in the case of Riskness.

So far as Riskness is concerned, there is significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Sciehce-Commerce at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce, the rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams, Arts-Science possesses the highest mean. Arts-Science-Commerce possesses the lowest mean in the case of Riskness alongwith Commerce and Science.

7. Localiteness :

This Table shows that one value is significant and three values are not significant in the case of Localiteness.

As far as Localiteness is concerned, there is a significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-

Commerce at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce, the rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams, Arts-Science possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possesses the lowest mean in the case of Localiteness.

8. Cosmopoliteness :

This Table shows that two values are highly significant and two values are not significant in the case of Cosmopoliteness.

So far as Cosmopoliteness is concerned, there is a highly significant mean difference between Arts-Science-Commerce and Arts-Science, Arts-Science and Arts-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highest significant mean difference is in favour of Arts-Science-Commerce and Arts-Commerce respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all streams, Commerce possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Cosmopoliteness.

5.4.4 Stream-Types of the Schools and the Components of Change-Related Values

TABLE 5.15

1. Traditionalism :

The Table No. 5.15 shows that one value is highly significant and three values are not significant in this case.

So far as Traditionalism is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams, Commerce possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possesses the lowest mean in the case of Traditionalism.

2. Progressivism :

This Table shows that two values are significant and two values are not significant in the case of Progressivism.

So far as Progressivism is concerned, there is a significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce; Arts-Science and Arts-Commerce at 0.05 level. The

TABLE : 5.15 : Stream Type of the Schools and Components of Change Related Values

	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism			Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Poneness		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
Arts																		
			3.82**			2.36*			2.97**			3.51**			1.35 NS			4.37**
Science																		
Commerce	40.59	6.31		40.36	5.36		34.91	8.53		35.52	7.77		32.28	9.30		43.34	5.19	
			1.12 NS			1.23 NS			2.64*			0.77 NS			2.73**			2.38*
Arts, Science & Commerce	37.56	6.88		38.20	7.90		31.66	9.50		32.26	7.97		30.81	9.24		39.13	8.80	
			0.08 NS			2.17*			3.65**			1.26 NS			2.57*			1.44 NS
Arts & Science	40.00	2.79		35.20	3.43		23.70	5.77		30.30	4.24		22.80	4.92		45.80	5.51	
			1.35 NS			1.84 NS			0.77 NS			0.11 NS			3.24**			0.43 NS
Arts & Commerce	39.81	7.43		40.21	7.25		33.07	8.04		33.50	7.99		29.98	8.77		42.53	7.11	
Commerce & Science	38.92	6.84		39.04	3.38		32.48	9.62		33.58	6.62		32.56	8.72		42.82	7.77	

Note: ** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce and Arts-Commerce respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the streams, Commerce possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Progressivism.

3.Dogmatism :

This Table shows that two values are highly significant, one value is significant and one value is not significant in this case. No schools have only Arts or only Science streams.

So far as 'Dogmatism' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce; Arts-Science and Arts-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce and Arts-Commerce respectively. There is significant mean difference between Arts-Science-Commerce and Arts-Science at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Arts-Science-Commerce. One value is not significant.

However, in all the streams Commerce possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Dogmatism.

4. Venturesomeness :

This Table shows that one value is significant and three values are not significant.in the case of Venturesomeness.

So far as Venturesomeness is concerned there is a significant mean difference between Commerce and Arts-Science-Commerce at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Commerce.The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all streams, Commerce possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Venturesomeness.

5. Conservatism :

This Table shows that two values are highly significant and one value is significant and one value is not significant. in the case of Conservatism.

So far as 'Conservatism' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Arts-Science-Commerce and Arts-Science; Arts-Commerce and Commerce-Science at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of Arts-Science-Commerce and Commerce-Science respectively.

In all the streams, Commerce-Science stream possesses the highest mean and Arts-Science possesses the lowest mean in the case of Conservatism.

6. Change Proneness :

One value is highly significant, one value is significant so far as Change Proneness is concerned.

The highly significant mean difference which is significant at .01 level is in favour of Commerce stream schools as compared to the schools having Arts, Science and Commerce streams. There is significant mean difference between Arts-Science and Commerce and Arts-Science at 0.05 level, the significant mean difference is in favour of Arts-Science. Two values are not significant. So far as the Change Proneness is concerned, Arts-Science stream school possess the highest mean and Arts-Science-Commerce possess the lowest mean.

5.5 Areas of the Schools and Innovative Proneness of Teachers

Table :5.16: Areawise Distribution of Sampled Schools and Teachers

Area	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers
Rural	460	46.0
Urban	540	54.0
Total	1000	100.0

From the above Table 5.16 out of 1000 teachers we see that 460 teachers belong to rural areas and 540 teachers belong to urban area, their percentages are 46.0 and 54.0 respectively.

Table :5.17: Area of Schools and Attitudes to Innovation

Area	Mean	SD	t value
Rural	115.60	21.74	2.51*
Urban	118.96	20.46	

* Significant at 0.05 level

The above Table 5.17 shows that there is a significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.05 level, the mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Attitudesto Innovations'.

Table :5.18: Area of the Schools and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Area	Mean	SD	t value
Rural	202.49	42.48	1.53 NS
Urban	206.42	39.29	

NS = Not significant

From the above Table 5.18 we find that there is not a significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of 'The Situational and Innovation Characteristics'.

Table :5.19: Area of the Schools and Change Related Values

Area	Mean	SD	t value
Rural	213.93	36.49	2.22*
Urban	219.16	37.46	

*- Significant at 0.05 level

From the above Table 5.19, it appears that there is a significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Change Related Values'.

Table :5.20: Area of the Schools and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Area	Mean	SD	t value
Rural	531.75	82.22	2.53 *
Urban	544.57	77.59	

* Significant at 0.05 level

From the above Table 5.20, it appears that there is significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.05 level. The mean difference is in favour of Urban area.

Table :5.21: Area of the Schools and Compontnets of Attitude to Innovation

Components	Rural Mean	Rural SD	Urban Mean	Urban SD	t-value
1. Individualization	20.29	4.15	20.89	3.84	2.40 *
2. Curriculum Organization	11.96	3.27	12.17	2.95	1.08 NS
3. Teaching-Learning Process	19.85	4.30	20.43	4.04	2.19 *
4. Teaching Resources	15.00	3.80	15.29	5.24	0.96 NS
5. Internal School Organization	18.37	4.46	19.15	4.21	2.84 **
6. Staff Development	18.64	4.41	19.30	4.38	2.37 *
7. School-Community Relationship	11.42	3.18	11.91	2.98	2.52 *

** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not significant

From the above Table, we see that there is a significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area at 0.05 level and significant mean difference is in favour of urban and in the case of Individualization.

There is no significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area, but mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Curriculum Organisation'. There is a

significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.05 level, and mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Teaching-Learning Process'. There is no significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area but mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Teaching Resources'. There is a highly significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at .01 level. The ~~highest~~ mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Internal School Organization'.

There is a significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Staff Development'. There is a significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.05 level. The mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'School Community Relationship'.

From the Table No. 5.22 on the next page, it appears that there is no significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of 'Administrative Support'.

There is no significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of 'Staff Norms'. There is no significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area

Table :5.22: Area of the Schools and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Rural		Urban		t-Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Administrative Support	26.77	7.32	27.20	7.34	0.92 NS
2. Staff Norms	34.26	14.65	33.29	14.38	1.05 NS
3. System Norms	16.65	7.25	17.05	7.34	0.87 NS
4. Complexity	21.62	5.74	22.40	5.36	2.21 *
5. Compatability	22.02	5.57	22.88	5.43	2.48 *
6. Riskness	31.43	7.04	32.79	6.77	3.10 **
7. Localiteness	31.09	6.96	33.20	6.64	3.03 **
8. Cosmopoliteness	17.68	6.60	17.52	7.53	0.34 NS

** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not significant

in the case of 'System Norms'. There is a significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.05 level and the mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Complexity'. There is a significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area at 0.05 level and mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Compatability'.

There is a highly significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in

favour of Urban area in the case of 'Riskness'.

There is highly significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.01 level, the mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Localiteness'. There is no significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of Cosmopoliteness.

Table :5.23: Area of the Schools and Components of Change Related Values

Components	URural		Urban		t - Values
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalism	38.15	7.23	39.46	6.86	2.95**
2. Progressivism	38.15	7.22	39.84	7.19	2.95**
3. Dogmatism	32.62	8.44	32.38	9.51	0.42 NS
4. Venturesomeness	33.17	7.69	33.22	7.80	0.10 NS
5. Conservatism	30.92	8.25	30.92	9.66	0.05 NS
6. Change Proneness	40.40	8.41	42.25	7.46	3.68 **

** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not significant

From the above Table, it appears that there is a highly significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area at 0.01 level, the mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Traditionalism'.

There is highly significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of Urban area in the case of 'Progressivism'.

There is not a significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of 'Dogmatism'.

There is no significant mean difference between Rural and Urban area in the case of 'Venturesomeness'.

There is no significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of 'Conservatism'.

There is highly significant mean difference between Rural area and Urban area in the case of 'Change Proneness'. The mean difference is in favour of Urban area.

5.6 Categories of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.24: Distribution of Teachers according to High, Moderate and Low Innovative Proneness

Category	Number	Percentage of Category
High Innovative	369	36.9
Moderate Innovative	620	62.0
Low Innovative	11	1.1
Total	1000	100.0

From the above table, it appears that among the

the 1000 sampled teachers 369 (36.9%) teachers have high Innovative Proneness and 620 (62.0%) teachers have moderate Innovative Proneness and 11 (1.1%) teachers have low Innovative Proneness. It is also noteworthy, that in the low category the number of teachers is very meagre.While, most of the teachers possess average Innovative Proneness and teachers with high Innovative Proneness are fairly good in number.

5.6.1 Categories of Teachers and Attitude to Innovations, Situational and Innovative Characteristics and Change-Related Values

Table 5.25

ξ. Attitudes to Innovation :

From the Table 5.25, it can be seen that all values are highly significant.

So far as Attitudes to Innovations is concerned, the mean differences between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers are significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean in the case of 'Attitude to Innovation'.

Table :5.25: Categories of Teachers and 'Attitude to Innovation', 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics'and 'Change Related Values', 'Innovative Proneness as a Whole'.

Categories of Teachers	Attitude to Innovation			The Situational and Innovative Characteristics			Change Related Values			Innovatige Proneness as a whole		
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. High Innovative	131.69	12.19		240.22	28.49		248.08	23.47		620.04	40.77	
			19.06**			19.05**			27.10**			4.32
2. Moderate Innovative	109.65	20.13		185.21	28.99		199.45	29.33		494.10	49.38	**
			5.44**			8.98**			6.41**			11.31
3. Low Innovative	76.09	28.88		104.18	57.43		141.27	52.97		321.55	85.84	**

** High significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not significant

2. Situational and Innovation Characteristics :

From the Table, it appears that all values are highly significant.

So far as 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative respectively.

In all categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean difference and Low Innovative teachers possess lowest mean in the case of 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics'.

3. The Change Related Values :

From Table, it appears that all values are highly significant.

So far as 'The Change Related Values' are concerned there is a highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean and low Innovative teachers possess lowest mean in the case of 'The Change Related Values'.

4. Innovative Proneness as a Whole :

So far as 'Innovative Proneness as a Whole' is concerned, highly significant mean differences are in favour of 'High Innovative' teachers between 'High Innovative and Moderate Innovative' teachers; and in favour of 'Moderate Innovative' teachers between 'Moderate Innovative' and 'Low Innovative' teachers.

5.6.2 Categories of Teachers and the Components of Attitude to Innovations :

TABLE 5.26

1. Individualisation :

From the Table 5.26, we see that there is highly significant mean difference in all cases.

So far as Individualisation is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative ; Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers, at 0.01 level and highly significant mean difference is in favour of 'High Innovative' and 'Moderate Innovative' teachers respectively.

However, in all categories 'High Innovative' teachers give highest mean and 'Low Innovative' teachers give lowest mean in the case of Individualisation.

TABLE : 5.26 : Categories of Teachers and Components of 'Attitudes to Innovations'

	Individualisation 1			Curriculum Organization 2			Teaching-Learning Process 3			Teaching Researches 4		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. High Innovative	22.37	2.18		13.51	1.97		22.23	2.84		17.27	5.17	
			11.02**			11.76**			12.65**			11.57**
2. Moderate Innovative	19.70	4.34		11.29	3.29		19.07	4.27		14.00	3.70	
			4.71**			3.55**			4.59**			3.99**
3. Low Innovative	13.46	5.45		7.73	3.85		13.01	4.53		9.55	5.56	

	Internal School organization 5			Staff Development 6			School Community Relationship 7		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. High Innovative	21.64	3.03		21.81	3.02		13.24	2.52	
			18.25**			17.53**			12.93**
2. Moderate Innovative	17.20	4.04		17.43	4.20		10.85	2.98	
			3.23**			3.31**			4.46**
3. Low Innovative	13.18	6.31		13.18	5.46		6.82	2.71	

Note: ** Highly significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not significant

2. Curriculum Organization :

This Table shows that in this case all values are highly significant.

So far as Curriculum Organisation is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers. Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of 'High Innovative' and 'Moderate Innovative' teachers respectively

In all categories High Innovative gives highest mean and Low Innovative gives the lowest mean in the case of Curriculum Organisation.

3. Teaching-Learning Process :

This Table shows that all the values are highly significant in the case of Teaching-Learning Process.

So far as Teaching-Learning Process is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between high Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative possesses the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possesses the lowest mean in the case of Teaching-Learning Process.

4. Teaching Resources :

From the same Table, it appears that all values are highly significant in this case.

So far as 'Teaching Resources' are concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers give the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers give lowest mean in the case of Teaching Resources.

5. Internal School Organisation :

From the Table, it appears that all the values are highly significant in this case.

So far as Internal School Organisation is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative

and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative give highest mean ~~di~~ and the Low Innovative teachers give the lowest mean in the case of Internal School Organisation.

6. Staff Development :

From the Table, it appears that all the values are highly significant.in this case.

So far as Staff Development is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative possesses the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Staff Development.

7. School Community Relationship :

From the Table, it appears that all the values are highly significant.in this case.

So far as School Community Relationship is concerned there is a highly significant mean difference between High Innovative teachers of Gujarat State and Moderate Innovative teachers of Gujarat State, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

However, in all categories High Innovative teachers give highest mean and Low Innovative teachers give lowest mean in the case of School Community Relationship.

5.6.3 Categories of Teachers and the Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

TABLE 5.27

1½ Administrative Support :

From the Table No. 5.27, we find that all the values are highly significant in the case of Administrative Support.

So far as Administrative Support is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and

Table :5.27: Categories of Teachers and the Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

	Administrative Supprt			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity		
	Mean	SD 1	t-value	Mean	SD 2	t-value	Mean	SD 3	t-value	Mean	SD 4	t-value
1. High Innovative	31.34	5.47		43.10	12.54		21.15	6.95		25.28	3.50	
			15.86**			17.73**			15.69**			15.57**
2. Moderate Innovative	24.65	6.92		28.38	12.67		14.44	6.23		20.32	5.49	
			4.67**			1.8 NS			2.39*			5.89**
3. Low Innovative	14.73	9.93		21.46	11.45		9.91	6.32		10.46	6.49	

	Compatibility			Riskness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness		
	Mean	SD 5	t-value	Mean	SD 6	t-value	Mean	SD 7	t-value	Mean	SD 8	t-value
1. High Innovative	25.66	3.45		35.37	3.93		35.68	4.17		22.20	5.88	
			15.40**			11.83**			11.41**			17.76**
2. Moderate Innovative	20.77	5.49		30.54	7.24		31.13	6.96		15.02	6.30	
			5.00**			6.56**			8.93**			3.62**
3. Low Innovative	12.36	7.45		15.91	11.55		12.18	7.82		8.10	5.59	

** Highly significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not significant

Low Innovative teacher at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean difference and Low Innovative teachers possess lowest mean in the case of Administrative Support.

2. Staff Norms :

From the Table, it appears that one value is highly significant and one value is not significant in this case.

So far as 'Staff Norms' is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative teachers.

There is no significant mean difference between Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers.

In all the categories High Innovative possess highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean.

3. System Norms :

From the same Table, it appears that in this case one value is highly significant and one value is significant.

So far as 'System Norms' is concerned, there is a highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative teachers.

There is significant mean difference between Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Moderate Innovative teachers.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of System Norms.

4. Complexity :

From the Table, it appears that all the values are highly significant in this case.

So far as Complexity is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative

teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the cases of Complexity.

5. Compatibility :

This Table shows that all values are highly significant so far as Compatibility is concerned. There is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Compatibility.

6. Riskness :

This Table shows that all values are highly significant so far as Riskness is concerned. There is a highly significant mean differance between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative

teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers give highest mean and Low Innovative teachers give lowest mean difference in the case of Riskness.

7. Localiteness :

This Table shows that all values are highly significant in the case of Localiteness.

So far as Localiteness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest significant mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all categories High Innovative possess highest mean and Low Innovative possess lowest mean in the case of Localiteness.

8. Cosmopoliteness :

This Table shows that all values are highly significant in this case. So far as Cosmopoliteness is concerned there is a highl significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate

Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative possess highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Cosmopoliteness.

5.6.4 Categories of Teachers and the Components of Change Related Values

TABLE 5.28

1. Traditionalism :

From the Table 28, it can be seen that all values are highly significant in this case.

So far as Traditionalism is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative give the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers give the lowest mean in the case of Traditionalism.

TABLE : 5.28 : Categories of Teachers and Components of Change Related Values

	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism			Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1. High Innovative	43.36	5.26		43.65	5.17		38.76	6.91		38.52	6.56		35.35	8.99		46.24	4.52	
			17.77**			16.56**			19.80**			19.38**			12.56**			16.55**
2. Moderate Innovative	36.42	6.31		36.82	6.84		28.89	7.96		30.25	6.45		28.48	7.91		38.84	7.85	
			5.56**			4.95**			1.44 NS			4.92**			3.32**			6.58**
3. Low Innovative	25.46	13.32		26.46	9.42		25.36	12.06		20.55	7.93		20.43	9.56		28.00	11.05	

Note: ** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

2. Progressivism :

In this case from the Table, it can be seen that all the values are highly significant.

So far as Progressivism is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of High innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess lowest mean in the case of Progressivism.

3. Dogmatism :

From the Table, it can be seen that one value is highly significant and one value is not significant in this case.

So far as Dogmatism is concerned there is a highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The high significant mean difference is in favour of High Innovative teachers.

The rest of the values are not significant.

In all the categories High Innovative possess the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Dogmatism.

4. Venturesomeness :

From the Table, it can be seen that all values are highly significant in the case of Venturesomeness.

So far as Venturesomeness is concerned there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories High Innovative teachers possess highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Venturesomeness.

5. Conservatism :

From the Table it can be seen that all values are highly significant in the case of Conservatism.

So far as Conservatism is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and

Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all categories High Innovative teachers possess the highest mean difference and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Conservatism.

6. Change Proneness :

From the same Table, it can be seen that all values are highly significant in the case of Change Proneness.

So far as Change Proneness is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between High Innovative and Moderate Innovative, Moderate Innovative and Low Innovative teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of High Innovative and Moderate Innovative teachers respectively.

In all the categories, High Innovative teachers possess the highest mean and Low Innovative teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of Change Proneness.

5.7 Age of the Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.29: Agewise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Age of the Teachers	No. of Teachers	Percentage
Below 35 Years	493	49.3
35 Years and Above	507	50.7
Total	1000	100.0

The above Table 5.29 shows the number and percentage of teachers in the case of Innovative Proneness of teachers according to the age of teachers.

One
Out of one thousand teachers, four hundred and ninety three teachers are below 35 years of age and five hundred and seven teachers are 35 years of age and above thirty five years of age and their percentages are 49.3 and 50.7 respectively.

Their mean differences are computed according to the three sections of the 'Innovative Proneness Scale' and also according to its twenty one components.

Table :5.30: Age of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Age	Mean	SD	t Value
Below 35 Years	533.67	81.77	1.95 *
35 Years and Above	543.54	77.94	

* Significant at 0.05 level

The above Table 5.30 shows that there is a significant mean difference between two categories of teachers at 0.05 level. The mean difference is in favour of teachers having 35 years and above 35 years of age. Teachers having 35 years of age and more than 35 years of age are little bit more Change Prone than those who are below 35 years of age.

Table :5.31: Age of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Attitudes to Innovation

Age of Teachers	Mean	SD	t Value
Below 35 Years	116.60	21.39	1.19 NS
35 Years and Above	118.20	20.82	

NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.31 shows that the mean difference is not significant, therefore, the obvious conclusion is

that Attitude to Innovation is ~~in~~different to the age of the teachers. The findings of Agraval (1974) and B.R. Panchal (1977) are also in consonance with the findings of the investigator.

Table :5.32: Age of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Attitudes to Innovations

Components	Below 35 Years		35 Years and Above		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualization	20.48	4.38	20.75	3.57	1.05 NS
2. Curriculum Organisation	12.01	2.87	12.13	3.32	0.63 NS
3. Teaching-Learning Process	19.73	4.31	20.59	3.98	3.26 **
4. Teaching Resources	15.19	5.42	15.22	3.72	0.41 NS
5. Internal Organization	18.60	4.28	18.99	4.39	1.44 NS
6. Staff Development	18.93	4.35	19.07	4.45	0.50 NS
7. School Community Relationship	11.56	3.04	11.81	3.12	1.27 NS

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.32 shows the mean scores of teachers below 35 years and above 35 years of age on various components of 'The Inventory of Attitudes to Innovation'.

It shows that the mean difference of less than 35 years of age ~~of teachers~~ and above 35 years of age of teachers

on 'Teaching Learning Process' is in favour of more than 35 years of age teachers and it can be further noted that the mean difference is highly significant. This means that the teachers having more than 35 years of age perceive the importance and manifest preferably attitude more favourable to 'Teaching Learning Process'.

On the rest of the components the teachers having 35 or more years of age get higher mean score but it should not be missed that all these mean differences are insignificant.

Table :5.33: Age of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Age of Teachers	Mean	SD	t value
Below 35 years	205.90	39.80	0.98 NS
35 Years and Above	203.36	41.78	

NS Not Significant

From the above Table 5.33, it is very clear that the age of the teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary schools does not play any significant role that is age has nothing to do either with Situational Characteristics or with the characteristics of the Innovation.

Table :5.34: Age of Teachers and Secondary and Higher Secondary School and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Below 35 Years		35 Years and Above		t Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Administrative Support	27.21	7.23	26.81	7.43	0.85 NS
2. Staff Norms	34.78	14.08	32.72	14.86	2.24 *
3. System Norms	17.34	6.98	16.41	7.57	2.02 *
4. Complexity	21.71	5.91	22.36	5.15	1.85 NS
5. Compatability	22.84	5.24	22.14	5.74	2.03 *
6. Riskness	31.77	6.81	32.55	7.01	1.78 NS
7. Localiteness	32.02	6.65	33.16	6.94	2.65 **
8. Cosmopoliteness	18.09	6.70	17.11	7.46	2.17 *

** Significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level
NS Not Significant

From the above Table 5.34, it appears that there is highly significant mean difference between the teachers of below 35 years of age and, 35 years and above 35 years of age in case of Localiteness at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of 35 years of age

and above 35 years of age teachers.

There is a significant mean difference between the teachers of Below 35 years of age and 35 years and above 35 years of age in the case of 'Staff Norms', 'System Norms', 'Compatibility', and 'Cosmopoliteness' at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of the teachers of below 35 years of age except in the case of 'Localiteness' where the mean difference is in favour of teachers having 35 or more years of age.

On the rest of the components age gives no significant mean difference.

Table :5.35: Age of the Teachers and Change Related Values

Age of the Teachers	Mean	SD	t value
Below 35 years	211.43	36.93	4.52 **
35 Years and Above	221.93	36.53	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

This Table 5.35 shows that teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools of 35 years of age and above 35 years of age give higher mean score on Change Related Values than their counterparts below 35 years of age. Mean

difference is highly significant at 0.01 level, and it is in favour of teachers who are 35 or above 35 years of age. Hence the obvious conclusion is that age of the teachers has very significant role to play with the Change-Related Values.

Table :5.36: Age of Teachers and Components of Change Related Values

Components	Below 35 years		35 Years and Above		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalisation	38.53	6.69	39.17	7.39	1.43 NS
2. Progressivism	38.17	7.26	40.25	7.07	4.60 **
3. Dogmatism	31.37	9.21	33.60	8.71	3.92 **
4. Venturesomeness	32.65	8.20	33.72	7.24	2.19 *
5. Conservatism	30.54	9.07	31.29	8.99	1.32 NS
6. Change Proneness	40.33	8.10	42.44	7.70	4.23 **

* Significant at 0.05 level NS Not significant
** Significant at 0.01 level

From the Table 5.36, it appears that Progressivism, Dogmatism, Change Proneness yield highly significant and favourable mean difference from the teachers of 35 years of age and above 35 years of age.

Here it is worth noting that the mean difference of the scores on Venturesomeness is in favour of the teachers of 35 years and above 35 years of age. The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

In the case of rest of the components of 'Change Related Values', the mean differences are not significant.

5.8 Sex of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.37: Distribution of sampled Teachers according to their Sex

Sex of Teachers	Number	Percentage
Male	797	79.7
Female	203	20.3

The above Table 5.37 shows the numbers and percentage of teachers according to the sex of teachers. From the above Table, we see that out of one thousand teachers seven hundred and ninety seven teachers are male teachers and two hundred and three teachers are female teachers.

Mean difference is computed according to three sections of the 'Innovative Proneness Scale' and also according to its twenty one components.

Table :5.38: Sex of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Sex	Mean	SD	t value
Male	532.91	80.11	
			4.56 **
Female	561.31	75.41	

** Significant at 0.01 level

This Table 5.38 shows the mean difference of sex of teachers and Innovative Proneness as a whole.

Mean difference is in favour of female teachers which is highly significant at 0.01 level. This shows that in the case of 'Change Related Values' the sex of a teacher plays a significant role.

Table :5.39: Sex of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and Attitudes to Innovation

Sex	Mean	SD	t value
Male	115.67	21.14	5.24**
Female	124.25	19.62	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table No.39 shows that mean score of Attitude to Innovation given by Female teachers is higher than that of Male teachers. It is further noted that mean difference between Male and Female teachers on 'Attitude to Innovation' is highly significant at 0.01 level

Table :5.40: Sex of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and the Components of Attitudes to Innovation

Components	Male		Female		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualisation	20.45	4.09	21.26	3.54	2.59**
2. Curriculum Organisation	11.96	3.30	12.53	2.13	2.37*
3. Teaching-Learning Process	19.77	4.11	21.73	4.04	6.11**
4. Teaching Resources	15.03	4.81	15.65	3.84	1.70 NS
5. Internal School Organisation	18.39	4.31	20.39	4.08	5.98**
6. Staff Development	18.91	4.46	19.36	4.16	1.29 NS
7. School Community Relationship	11.45	3.11	12.60	2.8	4.79**

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.40 shows that mean scores of male and female teachers of various componants of 'The Inventory of Attitudes to Innovation'.

Out of these components, the mean difference between male and female teachers on 'Individualisation', Teaching-Learning Process, Internal School Organisation, School Community Relationship is in favour of Female teachers and it is highly significant at 0.01 level. Further on 'Curriculum Organisation' the mean difference is in favour of female teachers and it is significant at 0.05 level.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

This shows that female teachers are significantly higher on 'Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Internal School Organisation, and School Community Relationship than the male teachers.

Table :5.41: Sex of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Sex	Mean	SD	t value
Male	204.10	40.85	0.78 NS
Female	206.62	40.70	

NS Not Significant

This Table 5.41 shows the mean scores of male and female teachers on 'Situational Characteristics and Innovation Characteristics'.

The mean difference is in favouf of female teachers but it is not significant.

The sex of teachers have nothing to do with 'Situational Characteristics' and with 'The Characteristics of the Innovation' itself.

Table :5.42: Sex of Teachers af Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Male		Female		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Administrative Support	26.69	7.5	28.26	6.34	2.73 **
2. Staff Norms	33.92	14.60	33.01	14.19	0.80 NS
3. System Norms	17.08	7.24	16.01	7.44	1.88 NS
4. Complexity	21.89	5.64	22.63	5.14	1.69 NS
5. Compatability	22.48	5.46	22.49	5.71	0.03 NS
6. Riskness	32.00	7.07	33.80	6.30	1.48 NS
7. Localiteness	32.27	6.97	33.92	6.02	3.10 **
8. Cosmopoliteness	17.62	7.02	17.49	7.49	0.23 NS

** Significant at 0.01 level NS Not Significant

Here in Table No. 5.42, it is worth noting that the difference of the mean scores on 'Administrative Support, and Localiteness' are in favour of female teachers, and the

mean difference is highly significant at 0.01 level, in the case of the rest of the components the differences are not significant.

Table :5.43: Sex of the Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Change Related Values

Sex	Mean	SD	t value
Male	213.14	36.36	
			6.22 **
Female	230.93	36.55	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

From the above Table 5.43, it appears that the mean scores of male and female teachers on 'Change Related Values', the difference is in favour of female teachers. It is highly significant.

The Table No. 5.44 on the next page shows ~~that~~ the mean scores of male and female teachers on various components of 'Change Related Values.

Table :5.44: Sex of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Componants of Change Related Values

Componants	Male		Female		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalism	38.58	7.24	39.96	6.21	2.50 *
2. Progressivism	38.50	7.26	42.07	6.40	6.39 **
3. Dogmatism	31.92	9.25	34.75	7.69	4.03 **
4. Venturesomeness	32.90	7.75	34.39	7.62	2.48 *
5. Conservatism	30.51	8.92	32.55	9.31	2.88 **
6. Change Proneness	40.91	8.01	43.32	7.48	3.88 **

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

Out of these components the mean differences between male and female teachers on 'Progressivism, Dogmatism, Conservatism and Change Proneness' are in favour of female teachers and they are highly significant at 0.01 level.

Further it also shows that the mean differences on 'Traditionalism and Venturesomeness' are in favour of female teachers significant at 0.05 level.

5.9 Experience of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.45: Distribution of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools according to their Experience

Experience of Teachers in Yrs.	Number	Percentage
Less than Five Years	243	24.3
More than Five Years	757	75.7
Total	1000	100.0

This Table 5.45 shows the numbers and percentage of teachers according to teaching experience of teachers.

Out of one thousand teachers two hundred and forty three teachers are having teaching experience of less than five years and seven hundred and fifty seven teachers are having teaching experience of more than five years.

Mean differences are computed according to the three sections of the 'Innovative Proneness Scale' and also according to twenty one components

Table :5.46: Teaching Experience of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Experience in Years	Mean	SD	t value
Less than Five Years	521.61	81.63	3.84**
More than Five years	544.1	78.73	

** Significant at 0.01 level

Table 5.46 shows the mean scores of teachers experiencewise.

The mean difference between the teachers having more than five years of teaching experience and the teachers having less than five years of experience which is highly significant at 0.01 level is in favour of teachers having more than five years of teaching experience. The experienced teachers play a significant role in Innovative Proneness taken as a whole.

Table :5.47: Teaching Experience of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Attitudes to Innovation

Experience in Years	Mean	SD	t Value
Less than Five Years	114.07	19.87	2.86**
More than Five Years	118.50	21.41	

** Highly Significant

The above Table 5.47 shows that the mean score of teachers experiencewise. All the teachers are divided into two parts : (i) Teachers having less than five years' experience and (ii) Teachers having more than Five years' experience. The mean difference on 'Attitudes to Innovation' is in favour of more experienced teachers. It is highly significant at 0.01 level. The experienced teachers play a significant role in the case of 'Attitudes to Innovation'.

Table :5.48: Teaching Experience of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Components	Teaching Experience				t value
	Lean than 5 Years		More than 5 Years		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualisation	20.05	4.37	80.0	3.9	2.55*
2. Curriculum Organisation	11.63	2.96	12.22	3.14	2.59**
3. Teaching-Learning Process	18.93	4.3	20.57	4.05	5.41**
4. Teaching Resources	14.95	6.57	15.23	3.81	0.82 NS
5. Internal School Organisation	18.49	3.82	18.89	4.49	1.24 NS
6. Staff Development	19.12	3.77	18.99	4.59	0.47 NS
7. School Community Relationship	11.4	2.9	11.78	3.13	1.69 NS

This Table 5.48 shows the mean scores, SD and t values of more experienced and less experienced teachers on various componnents of 'Attitude to Innovation'.

This Table shows that mean differences of more experienced and less experienced teachers on 'Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching Learning Process', which are in favour

of more experienced teachers, and it is significant in the case of Individualisation and highly significant in the case of (1) Curriculum Organisation and (2) Teaching Learning process. Rest of the values are not significant.

Table :5.49: Teaching Experience of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Situational and the Innovation Characteristics

Experience in Years	Mean	SD	t Value
Less than Five Years	204.4	39.11	0.07 NS
More than Five Years	204.62	41.36	

NS Not Significant

This Table 5.49 shows the mean, SD and t value of more experienced and less experienced teachers on 'Situational and the Innovation Characteristics' taken together.

The mean difference is in favour of more experienced teachers but it is not significant.

The Table 5.50 on the next page shows the componentwise mean scores, SDs and t values of less experienced and more experienced teachers on the components of 'Situational Characteristics and Characteristics of Innovation'. This Table shows that the

Table :5.50: Teaching Experience and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Teaching Experience				t value
	Less than 5 years		More than 5 years		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Administrative Support	27.21	7.14	26.94	7.4	0.51 NS
2. Staff Norms	35.47	13.96	33.15	14.64	2.17 *
3. System Norms	16.35	6.92	17.02	7.4	1.24 NS
4. Complexity	21.96	5.8	22.07	5.47	0.26 NS
5. Compatibility	22.4	4.89	22.51	5.7	0.28 NS
6. Riskness	31.87	6.63	32.24	7.01	0.72 NS
7. Localiteness	31.11	7.01	33.08	6.69	3.95 **
8. Cosmopoliteness	17.86	6.67	17.5	7.25	0.68 NS

** Significant at 0.01 level NS Not Significant
* Significant at 0.05 level

mean difference on 'Staff Norms' is in favour of less experienced teachers and it is significant at 0.05 level.

Further this Table shows that the mean difference on 'Localiteness' is in favour of more experienced teacher. It is highly significant at 0.01 level. It shows that experience plays significant role in 'Localiteness'. Most of the values are not significant.

Table :5.51: Experience of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Change Related Values

Experience in Years	Mean	SD	t value
Less than 5 years	203.06	36.93	6.76 **
More than 5 years	221.14	36.09	

** Highly significant

This Table 5.51 gives the mean scores of less experienced and more experienced teachers on 'Change Related Values'.

Mean difference is in favour of more experienced teacher. It is highly significant at 0.01 level. It shows that the Changed Related Values yield highly significant mean difference from the experienced teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary schools.

Table :5.52: Experience of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Changed Related Values

Components	Teaching Experience				t values
	Less than 5 Years		More than 5 Years		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalism	37.1	6.99	39.42	7.00	4.5**
2. Progressivism	37.17	7.26	39.88	7.11	5.14**
3. Dogmatism	29.45	8.99	33.48	8.83	6.15**
4. Venturesomeness	31.20	8.53	33.84	7.37	4.66**
5. Conservatism	28.34	8.68	31.75	9.00	5.18**
6. Change Proneness	39.64	8.78	41.96	7.61	3.49**

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

In Table 5.52 all the mean differences on the various components of 'Change Related Values' are significantly in favour of more experienced teachers. They are highly significant at .01 level. It shows that the components of Change Related Values are significantly in favour of the experienced teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary schools.

5.10 Academic Qualifications of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.53: Academic Qualificationswise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Qualifications	Number	Percentage
S.S.C.	19	1.9
B.A.	301	30.1
B.Com.	43	4.3
B.Sc.	189	18.9
M.A.	278	27.8
M.Com.	91	9.1
M.Sc.	79	7.9
Total	1000	100.0

The above Table 5.53 shows that the number of teachers having B.A. degree is the highest.

Table :5.54: Academic Qualifications of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and their Innovative Proneness as a Whole

The Inventory of Attitude to Innovations	Qualifications	Mean	SD	t Value
	S.S.C.	494.11	100.91	2.47*
	B.A.	542.94	82.29	2.28*
	B.Com.	512.70	73.76	1.79 NS
	B.Sc.	533.49	67.76	0.74 NS
	M.A.	538.59	76.76	2.23*
	M.Com.	561.07	101.50	1.97*
	M.Sc.	534.15	71.58	2.01*
	S.S.C.	494.11	100.91	

* Significant at 0.05 level
NS Not Significant

Table 5.54 above shows mean scores and 't' values of teachers according to their qualifications that is S.S.C., B.A., B.Com., B.Sc., M.A., M.Com., M.Sc. These mean scores are on 'Innovative Proneness'. Teachers possessing M.Com degree give the highest mean score and teachers possessing S.S.C. give the lowest mean score. The mean difference between S.S.C. and B.A. degree teachers is significantly at (0.05) in favour of teachers with B.A. degree. Between the teachers having B.A. degree and the teachers having B.Com degree the mean difference is significantly in favour of the teachers possessing

B.A. degree. Between the teachers having M.A. degree and the teachers having M.Com. degree the mean difference is significantly in favour of the teachers possessing M.Com. degree. Between teachers having M.Com. degree and M.Sc. degree the mean difference is significantly in favour of teachers having M.Com. degree. Between teachers having M.Sc. degree and teachers with S.S.C. is significantly in favour of the teachers having M.Sc. degree.

Table :5.55: Academic Qualifications of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and their Attitude to Innovation

Academic Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
S.S.C.	109.21	30.78	
			1.84 NS
B.A.	118.96	21.81	
			3.0 **
B.Com.	108.42	19.34	
			2.09 *
B.Sc.	116.16	22.49	
			0.26 NS
M.A.	116.69	20.30	
			0.80 NS
M.Com.	118.64	20.29	
			1.44 NS
M.Sc.	122.56	14.04	
			2.84 **
S.S.C.	109.21	30.78	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level NS Not significant
* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 5.55 shows mean, SD and t values of S.S.C., B.A., B.Com., B.Sc., M.A., M.Com., M.Sc. on their Attitudes to Innovation. Between B.Com. and B.A. teachers the mean difference is highly significant in favour of B.A. teachers, between B.Sc.

and B.Com. degree teachers the mean difference is significantly in favour of B.Sc. degree teachers ; between M.Sc. and S.S.C. teachers the mean difference is highly significantly in favour of M.Sc. degree teachers.

: TABLE 5.56 :

The Table 5.56 shows mean, SD and t value of teachers having various academic qualifications in the context of the components of 'Attitude to Innovation'. So far as Individualisation is concerned, the mean difference is highly and significantly in favour of B.A. teachers as compared to teachers with S.S.C., between B.Com. and B.Sc., the mean difference is in favour of teachers having B.Sc. degree, and between M.Sc. and S.S.C. teachers, the mean difference is in favour of the teachers having M.Sc. degree. Similarly the mean difference is significantly in favour of B.A. degree teachers as compared to the B.Com. degree teachers, and the mean difference is in favour of M.Sc. degree teachers as compared to M.Com. degree teachers.

So far Curriculum Organisation is concerned, between S.S.C. and B.A. teachers, between B.A. and B.Com. teachers, between M.Com. and M.Sc. teachers and between M.Sc. and S.S.C.

Table :5.56: Academic Qualifications of Teachers and Components of 'Attitude to Innovation

Academic Qualification	Individualization			Curriculum Organization			Teaching-Learning Process			Teaching Resources			Internal School Organization			Staff Development			School Community Relationship		
	Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. S.S.S.Passed	17.37	7.46		10.58	4.88		17.53	6.56		15.79	3.66		19.53	2.59		18.00	4.77		10.42	3.86	
			3.29**			2.53*			3.04**			0.11NS			0.46NS			0.51NS			2.09*
2. B.A.Degree	20.40	3.57		12.21	2.54		20.63	4.14		15.64	6.15		19.06	4.4		18.61	6.0		12.08	3.29	
			2.30*			2.05*			2.76**			1.93NS			3.59**			0.32NS			1.85NS
3. B.Com Degree	19.00	4.45		11.30	3.73		18.84	3.26		13.77	4.21		16.42	4.38		16.35	4.13		11.09	2.92	
			3.5**			1.35 NS			1.08NS			1.71NS			2.79**			0.83NS			0.49NS
4. B.Sc. Degree	21.21	3.56		12.05	3.14		19.59	4.31		15.96	4.11		18.61	4.55		18.97	4.48		13.34	2.98	
			1.05NS			0.09NS			1.1NS			0.22NS			0.04NS			0.14NS			0.11NS
5. M.A.Degree	20.83	4.07		12.02	3.35		20.03	4.11		11.48	3.69		18.63	4.36		19.03	4.17		11.31	2.83	
			1.3 NS			0.50NS			1.28NS			0.73NS			0.73NS			1.8 NS			3.39**
6. M.Com. Degree	20.15	4.77		11.84	2.15		20.66	3.96		14.55	3.92		18.01	4.21		19.89	3.31		12.51	3.19	
			2.05*			2.15*			0.72NS			2.92**			1.03NS			0.33NS			0.97NS
7. M.Ed. Degree	21.44	3.16		12.85	3.86		21.08	3.57		16.05	2.53		19.63	3.53		20.06	3.5		12.06	2.71	
			3.71**			2.18*			3.24**			0.37NS			0.12NS			2.15NS			2.17*
8. S.S.C.Passed	17.37	7.46		10.58	4.88		17.53	3.6		15.79	3.6		19.53	2.59		18.00	4.7		10.42	3.86	

** Highly significant at .01 level * Significant at .05 level NS Not significant

teachers the mean differences are in favour of B.A. teachers, in first both the cases and in favour of M.Sc. teachers in last two cases.

So far as Teaching Learning Process is concerned, between S.S.C. and B.A. teachers, B.A. and B.Com., teachers, M.Sc. and S.S.C. teachers, the mean differences are in favour of B.A. teachers, in both the first two cases and in favour of M.Sc. teachers respectively.

So far as 'Teaching Resources' is concerned, the mean difference is in favour of M.Sc. degree teachers as compared to M.Com. degree teachers.

So far as 'Internal School Organisation' is concerned, the mean difference is in favour of B.A. degree teachers as compared to B.Com. degree teachers and in favour of B.Sc. degree teachers as compared to B.Com. degree teachers.

So far as 'Staff Development' is concerned, there is no significant mean difference. So far as 'School Community Relation' is concerned, between M.A. degree

and M.Com. degree teachers, the mean difference is in favour of M.Com. degree teachers. Similarly between S.S.C. teachers and B.A. teachers; M.Sc. teachers and S.S.C. teachers, the significant mean differences are in favour of B.A. teachers, and M.Sc. teachers respectively.

Table :5.57: Academic Qualifications of Teachers and The Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Academic Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
S.S.C.	197.47	37.88	
			0.29 NS
B.A.	200.31	42.41	
			0.10 NS
B.Com.	199.63	41.70	
			1.15 NS
B.Sc.	206.75	35.28	
			0.39 NS
M.A.	205.34	40.76	
			2.65 **
M.Com.	218.31	42.66	
			2.49 *
M.Sc.	202.01	42.58	

** Highly Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.57 shows Mean, SD and 't' values of S.S.C., B.A., B.Com., B.Sc., M.A., M.Com., M.Sc. teachers on their 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics'. Between M.A. and M.Com. teachers the mean difference is

highly significant in favour of M.Com. teachers, and between M.Com. and M.Sc. teachers the mean difference is significantly in favour of M.Com. teachers.

TABLE 5.58

The Table No. 5.58 shows Mean, SD and 't' values of teachers having various academic qualifications in the context of the components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics. So far as 'Administrative Support' is concerned, there is no significant value.

So far as 'Staff Norms' are concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between M.A. degree teachers and M.Com. degree teachers, M.Com. degree teachers and M.Sc. degree teachers and mean difference is in favour of M.Com. degree teachers in both the cases. So far as 'System Norms' are concerned, there is significant mean difference between M.Com. degree teachers and M.Sc. degree teachers and mean difference is in favour of M.Com. degree teachers.

So far as 'Complexity' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Sc.degree teachers and M.A degree teachers and mean difference is in favour of B.Sc. degree teachers.

Table :5.58: Academic Qualifications of Teachers and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Academic Qualifications	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity			Compatibility			Riskness			Localite-ness			Cosmopoli-teness		
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. S.S.C.Passed	29.0	6.97		29.79	12.57		15.63	6.64		20.68	6.18		21.74	5.16		29.47	6.36		28.84	6.7		20.63	5.98	
			1.25NS			0.76NS			0.47NS			0.4NS			0.3NS			1.42NS			2.22*		2.18*
2. B.A.Degree	26.94	6.98		32.46	14.96		16.49	7.81		21.22	5.62		21.78	5.55		31.85	7.12		32.48	6.93		17.05	7.01	
			1.38NS			0.3 NS			0.46NS			1.37NS			1.4NS			0.17NS			1.86NS		0.41NS
3. B.Com.Degree	25.33	8.60		33.19	13.59		15.91	7.48		22.47	5.15		23.02	4.71		32.05	6.39		30.40	6.40		16.58	7.15	
			1.65NS			0.26NS			1.81NS			1.38NS			0.37NS			0.64NS			1.49NS		1.14NS
4. B.Sc.Degree	27.38	7.03		33.80	14.21		17.78	5.80		23.56	4.60		23.3	4.67		31.33	6.65		32.03	6.53		17.81	6.22	
			0.7 NS	0		0.25NS			1.12NS			3.98**			1.48NS			1.87NS			2.31*		0.77LS
5. M.A.Degree	26.88	7.85		33.47	14.23		17.07	7.37		21.6	5.65		22.56	5.83		32.58	7.34		33.49	6.81		17.30	7.49	
			0.99NS			4.21**			0.93NS			1.57NS			1.97*			0.36NS			0.74NS		3.00**
6, M.Com. Degree	27.78	6.26		40.55	12.91		17.91	7.91		22.65	5.32		23.90	5.04		32.88	5.98		32.87	7.55		20.06	7.96	
			1.32NS			3.00**			2.49*			0.18NS			3.09**			0.92NS			0.22NS		2.54*
7. M.Sc. Degree	26.34	7.96		32.76	15.33		15.01	7.20		22.48	6.53		21.19	6.40		37.75	6.37		33.10	5.92		17.15	6.76	
			1.34NS			0.78NS			0.34NS			1.09NS			0.35NS			2.63**			2.74**		2.06*
S.S.C. Passed	29.00	6.97		29.79	12.57		15.63	6.64		20.68	6.18		21.74	5.16		29.47	6.36		28.84	6.7		20.63	5.98	

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

So far as 'Compatibility' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between M.Com. degree teachers and M.Sc. degree teachers and significant difference between M.Com. degree teachers and M.A. degree teachers, and mean difference is in favour of M.Com. degree teachers in both the cases.

So far as 'Riskness' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between M.Sc. degree teachers and S.S.C. teachers. Mean difference is in favour of M.Sc. degree teachers.

So far as 'Localiteness' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between M.Sc. degree teachers and S.S.C. teachers, the mean difference is in favour of M.Sc. degree teachers. Similarly there is a significant mean difference between S.S.C. teachers and B.A. degree teachers; B.Sc. degree teachers and M.A. degree teachers and mean difference is in favour of B.A. degree teachers and M.A. degree teachers respectively.

So far as 'Cosmopoliteness' is concerned, there is a highly significant mean difference between M.A. degree teachers and M.Com. degree teachers and mean difference is in favour of M.Com. degree teachers. Similarly there is

significant mean difference between S.S.C. teachers and B.A. degree teachers ; M.Com. degree and M.Sc. degree teachers; B.Sc. degree and S.S.C. teachers and mean difference is in favour of S.S.C. teachers, M.Com degree teachers and S.S.C. teachers respectively.

Table :5.59: Academic Qualifications of Teachers and Change Related Values

Academic Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
S.S.C.	187.42	49.09	
			3.79 **
B.A.	324.12	38.21	
			3.15 **
B.Com.	204.67	34.91	
			1.13 NS
B.Sc.	210.54	29.81	
			1.95 NS
M.A.	216.54	34.20	
			1.67 NS
M.Com.	224.12	46.91	
			2.26 *
M.Sc.	209.58	35.20	
			2.27 *
S.S.C.	187.4	49.00	

** Highly Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level
NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.59 shows mean difference, SD and 't' values of S.S.C., B.A., B.Com., B.Sc., M.A., M.Com., M.Sc. teachers on 'Change Related Values'. Between S.S.C. teachers and B.A. degree teachers, B.A. degree teachers and

B.Com. degree teachers highly significant mean difference is in favour of B.A. degree teachers in both the cases.

There is a significant difference between M.Com. degree teachers and M.Sc. degree teachers; M.Sc. degree teachers and S.S.C. passed teachers and mean difference is in favour of M.Com. degree teachers and M.Sc. degree teachers respectively.

TABLE 5.60

The Table No. 5.60 shows mean, SD and 't' values of teachers having various academic qualifications in the context of the components of 'Change Related Values'. So far as 'Traditionalism is concerned, between the teachers having S.S.C. and the teachers having B.A. degree, the teachers having B.A. degree and B.Com. degree; teachers having B.Sc. degree and M.A. degree; Teachers having M.Sc. degree and M.Com. degree, the mean difference is highly and significantly in favour of teachers having B.A. degree in first two cases, and the teachers having M.A. degree and teachers having M.Com. degree respectively. So far as 'Progressivism' is concerned, between the teachers having B.A. degree and B.Com. degree; B.Com. degree and B.Sc. degree, the mean difference is highly significantly in favour of B.A. degree teachers and significantly in favour of B.Sc. degree teachers.

Table :5.60: Academic Qualification of Teachers and Components of Change Related Values

Academic Qualifications	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism			Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. S.S.C.Passed	33.90	9.21		37.26	6.94		29.95	8.49		27.11	12.54		28.90	8.43		33.37	13.92	
			3.28**			1.74NS			2.09*			3.9**			2.70NS			3.92**
2. B.A. Degree	39.31	6.82		40.39	7.62		33.85	7.85		34.29	7.41		32.14	8.02		41.71	8.61	
			2.65**			3.04**			2.12*			2.35*			2.79**			0.33NS
3. B.Com. Degree	36.37	6.63		36.70	6.06		31.16	7.25		31.42	8.20		28.49	7.98		41.06	7.32	
			1.10NS			2.17*			0.16NS			0.52NS			0.52NS			0.11NS
4. B.Sc. Degree	37.66	6.94		38.96	6.17		31.40	9.19		32.00	6.34		29.27	9.03		41.13	6.53	
			3.69**			0.38NS			0.67NS			1.68NS			1.78NS			0.54NS
5. M.A. Degree	40.03	6.68		39.2	7.36		31.98	9.0		33.14	7.68		30.78	9.06		41.50	7.73	
			0.19NS			1.67NS			2.02*			2.23*			3.72**			0.53NS
6. M.Com. Degree	39.87	7.44		37.68	7.94		34.32	11.26		35.28	8.73		34.99	10.22		41.99	7.88	
			2.27**			1.51NS			2.01*			2.44*			4.66**			0.12NS
7. M.Sc. Degree	37.28	7.42		39.18	6.85		30.99	10.22		32.10	8.10		27.85	9.65		41.85	7.08	
			1.7 NS			1.09NS			0.41NS			2.15*			0.43NS			3.78**
S.S.C.Passed	33.90	9.21		37.26	6.94		29.95	8.40		27.11	12.54		28.90	8.43		33.37	13.92	

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

So far as 'Dogmatism' is concerned, between S.S.C. teachers and B.A. degree teachers ; B.A. degree teachers and B.Com. degree teachers; M.A. degree teachers and M.Com. degree teachers ; M.Com. degree teachers and M.Sc. degree teachers, the mean difference is significantly in favour of teachers having B.A. degree in the first two cases, and M.Com. degree teachers in the last two cases.

So far as 'Venturesomeness' is concerned, between the teachers having S.S.C. and B.A. degree; B.A. degree and B.Com. degree; M.A. degree and M.Com. degree; M.Com. degree and M.Sc. degree, M.Sc. and S.S.C. the mean difference is highly significant and in favour of B.A. degree and significantly in favour of B.A. degree, and M.Com. degree in the next two cases and M.Sc. degree in the last case.

So far as 'Conservatism' is concerned, between the teachers having B.A. degree and B.Com. degree, M.A. degree and M.Com. degree; M.Com. degree and M.Sc. degree, the mean difference is highly significant and in favour of B.A. degree, and M.Com. degree teachers in the last two cases.

So far as 'Change Proneness' is concerned, between the teachers having S.S.C. and B.A. degree, M.Sc. degree and S.S.C., the mean difference is highly significant in favour of teachers having B.A. degree, and M.Sc. degree teachers respectively.

5.10 Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :61: Professional Qualificationwise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Professional Qualifications	Number	Percentage
Untrained	144	14.4
T.D.	90	9.0
D.P.Ed.	14	1.4
B.T.	5	0.5
B.Ed.	680	68.0
M.Ed.	67	6.7
Total	1000	100.0

From the above Table 5.61, it appears that the number of the sampled teachers having B.Ed. degree is the highest and number of teachers having B.T. degree is the lowest.

In the Table No. 5.62 on the next page, the 't' values are not significant, however, the teachers having T.D. qualifications give the highest mean score on Innovative Proneness as a whole. But this mean difference is not statistically significant.

Table :5.62: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Professional Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
Untrained	542.10	100.86	
			0.94 NS
T.D.	553.57	71.58	
			0.33 NS
D.P.Ed.	546.93	66.71	
			1.93 NS
B.T.	478.60	71.75	
			1.69 NS
B.Ed.	537.09	77.33	
			0.71 NS
M.Ed.	530.15	66.49	
			0.88 NS
Untrained	542.10	100.10	

NS Not Significant

Table :5.63: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and their Attitude to Innovations

Professional Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
Untrained	118.35	20.39	
			0.55 NS
T.D.	119.87	20.64	
			0.66 NS
D.P.Ed.	123.79	19.77	
			1.80 NS
B.T.	105.80	11.03	
			1.19 NS
B.Ed.	118.00	20.99	
			4.58 **
M.Ed.	105.64	21.98	
			4.11 **
Untrained	118.35	20.39	

** Highly significant at .01 level NS Not Significant

From the Table No. 5.63, it appears that two values are highly significant and four values are not significant.

So far as 'Attitudes to Innovations' is concerned, there are highly significant mean differences between B.Ed. and M.Ed., and M.Ed. and Untrained at 0.01 level, the mean differences are in favour of B.Ed. and Untrained teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the 'Professional Qualifications the D.P.Ed. possesses highest mean difference and M.Ed. possesses the lowest mean difference in the case of 'Attitudes to Innovation'.

TABLE 5.64

From the Table No. 5.64 it appears that some values are highly significant and some values are not significant.

So far as 'Individualisation' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers; M.Ed. teachers and untrained teachers at 0.01 level ; the highly significant mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers ,and Untrained teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

Table :5.64: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Professional Qualifications	Individualisation			Curriculum Organisation			Teaching-Learning Experience			Teaching Resources			Internal School Organisation			Self Development			School Community Relationship		
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. Untrained	20.22	4.49		12.22	2.75		20.17	4.00		14.76	3.77		19.42	4.16		19.90	3.54		11.73	3.42	
			1.19NS			0.06NS			1.37NS			1.05NS			1.65NS			1.56NS			2.09*
2. T.D.	19.56	4.35		12.19	3.63		20.97	4.84		15.3	3.96		20.31	3.78		19.12	4.01		12.71	3.64	
			0.70NS			0.45NS			0.51NS			1.08NS			0.31NS			1.33NS			0.07NS
3. D.P.Ed.	20.43	4.43		12.64	2.24		20.29	3.54		16.5	3.35		20.64	3.30		20.64	3.80		12.64	2.71	
			0.18NS			0.84NS			1.03NS			3.00**			1.34NS			2.67*			1.58NS
4. B.T. Degree	20.80	1.92		11.6	2.79		18.60	1.14		11.4	2.97		18.00	5.05		15.8	2.17		10.60	1.52	
			0.16NS			0.45NS			0.88NS			1.78NS			0.28NS			1.56NS			0.85NS
5. B.Ed.Degree	21.07	3.74		12.18	2.98		20.23	4.14		14.32	4.02		18.55	4.36		19.0	4.57		11.70	2.91	
			5.88**			4.35**			3.31**			1.80NS			1.84NS			3.74**			4.77**
6. M.Ed. Degree	18.25	3.82		10.46	3.95		18.49	3.76		14.19	4.29		17.52	4.74		16.82	4.37		9.94	2.65	
			3.10**			3.73**			2.88**			0.97NS			2.96**			5.46**			3.79**
Untrained	20.22	4.49		12.22	2.75		20.17	4.00		14.76	3.77		19.42	4.16		19.90	3.54		11.73	3.42	

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

However, in all the trained teachers, B.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and M.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Individualisation'.

So far as 'Curriculum Organisation' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers, M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers at 0.01 level, the highly significant mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers, and Untrained teachers respectively, the rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and M.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Curriculum Organisation'.

So far as 'Teaching-Learning Process' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers, M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers, and Untrained teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and M.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Teaching Learning Process'.

So far as 'Teaching Resources' are concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in the trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Teaching Resources'.

So far as 'Internal School Organisation' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Untrained teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and M.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Internal School Organisation'.

So far as 'Staff Development' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers, at 0.01 level. The highest mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Staff Development'.

So far as 'School Community Relationship' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers, M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers, and Untrained teachers respectively.

In the case of School Community Relationships, the significant mean difference is, significant at .05 level, is

in favour of teachers having T.D. qualification as compared to Untrained teachers.

However, in all kinds of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess highest mean and M.Ed. teachers possess lowest mean in the case of 'School Community Relationship'.

Table :5.65: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Professional Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
Untrained	209.01	47.90	
			2.26 *
T.D.	195.77	35.68	
			0.41 NS
D.P.Ed.	200.14	44.33	
			1.74 NS
B.T.	160.8	39.82	
			2.44 *
B.Ed.	204.87	40.29	
			0.76 NS
M.Ed.	208.72	32.08	
			0.05 NS
Untrained	209.1	47.90	

* Significant at .05 level
NS Not Significant

From the Table No. 5.65, it appears that two values are significant and other values are not significant.

So far as 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics' is concerned, there is a significant mean difference between B.T. teachers and B.Ed. teachers, Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers at 0.05 level. The mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all kinds of teachers, Untrained teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics'.

TABLE 5.66

From the Table No. 5.66, it appears that all the values are not significant.

However, in all trained teachers, B.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and D.P.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Administrative Support'.

So far as 'Staff Norms' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers; and B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers at 0.01 level. The mean differences are in favour of Untrained

Table :5.66: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Professional Qualifications	Administrative Support			Staff Norms			System Norms			Complexity			Compatibility			Risnness			Localiteness			Cosmopoliteness	
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD
1. Untrained	26.69	7.64		26.27	15.47		18.35	8.28		21.79	5.65		22.56	5.29		32.74	6.17		32.05	7.37		18.55	8.18
			0.21NS			4.24**			5.42**			0.54NS			1.42NS			2.52*			2.38*		2.00
2. T.D.	26.67	6.54		27.58	14.93		12.69	6.92		22.16	3.77		21.40	6.01		34.63	4.53		34.21	5.62		16.21	9.41
			1.31NS			0.01NS			1.64NS			1.64NS			2.23NS			0.25NS			0.26NS		0.47N
3. D P.Ed.	24.14	7.82		27.64	20.50		16.07	8.68		24.07	5.73		23.14	2.83		24.29	6.26		33.79	6.23		15.00	5.00
			0.47NS			0.12NS			0.21NS			2.58*			4.98**			3.80**			4.13**		0.58N
4. B.T.Degree	26.00	6.78		28.80	9.15		15.20	5.50		17.00	3.24		16.00	5.20		21.60	6.88		19.20	8.32		17.00	4.42
			0.38NS			0.76NS			0.55NS			1.94*			2.80**			3.24**			4.35**		
5. D.Ed.Degree	27.28	7.51		33.59	14.25		16.23	7.06		22.09	5.88		22.69	5.34		31.92	7.10		32.41	6.76		17.69	6.61
			1.33NS			2.80**			2.31*			0.35NS			1.76NS			1.69NS			2.21*		0.74
6. M.Ed.Degree	26.03	5.53		38.67	9.46		18.97	5.43		21.84	3.45		21.46	6.77		30.38	7.93		34.31	6.36		17.06	6.16
			0.63NS			1.17NS			0.55NS			0.06NS			1.28NS			2.36*			2.17*		1.33
. Untrained	26.69	7.64		26.27	15.47		18.35	8.28		21.79	5.65		22.56	5.29		32.74	6.17		32.05	7.37		18.55	8.17

* Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

teachers and M.Ed. teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, M.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and T.D. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Staff Norms'.

So far as 'System Norms' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers, at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of Untrained teachers. There is a significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of M.Ed. teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, M.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and T.D. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'System Norms'.

So far as 'Complexity' is concerned, there is a significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers, B.T. teachers and B.Ed. teachers, at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers and B.Ed. teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers, possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Complexity'.

So far as 'Compatibility' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers, B.T. teachers and B.Ed. teachers at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers, and B.Ed. teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant. T.D. teachers and D.P.Ed. teachers possess significant mean difference in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers.

However, in all the trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Compatibility'.

So far as 'Riskness' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers, B.T. teachers and B.Ed. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers and B.Ed. teachers respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers, M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean differences are in favour of T.D. teachers, and Untrained

respectively.The rest of values are not significant.

However, in all the types of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Riskness'.

So far as Localiteness is concerned, there is a highly significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers ; and B.T. teachers and B.Ed. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers and B.Ed. teachers respectively.

There is a significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers, B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers, M.Ed. teachers and Untrained teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of T.D. teachers, M.Ed. teachers, and again M.Ed. teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all the types of trained teachers, M.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Localiteness' along with teachers with T.D. qualifications.

So far as 'Cosmopoliteness' is concerned, there is a significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and

T.D. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of Untrained teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, Untrained teachers possess the highest mean and D.P.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Cosmopoliteness'.

Table :5.67: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Change Related Values

Professional Qualifications	Mean	SD	t value
Untrained	214.61	42.42	
			4.02 **
T.D.	237.93	44.45	
			1.23 NS
D.P.Ed.	223.00	19.75	
			1.01 NS
B.T.	211.00	30.59	
			0.22 NS
B.Ed.	214.41	35.01	
			0.31 NS
M.Ed.	215.79	28.53	
			0.21 NS
Untrained	214.61	42.42	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

Change Related Values as a Whole :

The above Table 5.67 shows that one value is highly significant and all other values are not significant.

So far as 'Change Related Values' as a whole is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean is in favour of T.D. teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Change Related Values' as a whole.

TABLE 5.68

The Table No. 5.68 shows that all values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and D.P.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Traditionalism'.

So far as 'Progressivism' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of T.D. teachers.

There is a significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant

Table :5.68: Professional Qualifications of Teachers and Components of Change Related Values

Professional Qualifications	Traditionalism			Progressivism			Dogmatism			Venturesomeness			Conservatism			Change Proneness		
	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t	Mean	SD	t
1. Untrained	38.57	7.13		37.83	8.07		32.01	10.08		33.71	9.30		32.10	9.60		40.58	8.09	
			1.96NS			5.14**			2.63**			1.02NS			2.39*			1.61NS
2. T.D.	40.46	7.23		43.12	6.99		35.34	8.34		32.46	8.87		35.02	8.24		42.44	9.52	
			1.65NS			0.58NS			0.58NS			2.06*			2.18*			0.32NS
3. D.P.Ed.	37.21	3.33		42.00	4.74		34.00	5.63		37.43	4.27		30.14	3.74		43.29	6.20	
			0.88NS			1.44NS			0.18NS			0.18NS			1.42NS			1.19NS
4. B.T. Degree	39.00	5.39		36.6	8.06		34.60	8.47		33.00	9.67		33.20	7.56		35.60	3.78	
			0.05NS			0.19NS			0.60NS			0.02NS			0.82NS			1.73NS
5. B.Ed. Degree	38.84	7.03		39.17	6.87		32.15	9.09		32.94	7.36		29.93	8.86		41.51	7.75	
			1.11NS			2.48*			0.51NS			1.99*			2.68**			1.94NS
6. M.Ed. Degree	37.84	7.51		36.97	7.67		32.73	6.69		34.79	6.20		32.99	9.47		39.69	7.77	
			0.65NS			0.73NS			0.54NS			0.87NS			0.63NS			0.75NS
Untrained	38.57	7.13		37.83	8.07		32.00	10.08		33.71	9.30		32.10	9.60		40.58	8.09	

** Highly significant at .01 level

* Significant at .05 level

NS Not significant

mean difference is in favour of B.Ed. teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and M.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Progressivism'.

So far as 'Dogmatism' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of T.D. teachers.

The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and Untrained teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Dogmatism'.

So far as 'Venturesomeness' is concerned, there is a significant mean difference between T.D. teachers and D.P.Ed. teachers; B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers respectively. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and T.D. teachers possess

the lowest mean in the case of 'Venturesomeness'.

So far as 'Conservatism' is concerned, there is highly significant mean difference between B.Ed. teachers and M.Ed. teachers at 0.01 level. The highly significant mean difference is in favour of M.Ed. teachers.

There is a significant mean difference between Untrained teachers and T.D. teachers, T.D. teachers and D.P.Ed. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of T.D. teachers in both the cases.

The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, T.D. teachers possess the highest mean and B.Ed. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Venturesomeness'.

So far as 'Change Proneness' is concerned, the significant mean difference between D.P.Ed. teachers and B.T. teachers at 0.05 level. The significant mean difference is in favour of D.P.Ed. teachers. The rest of the values are not significant.

However, in all types of trained teachers, D.P.Ed. teachers possess the highest mean and B.T. teachers possess the lowest mean in the case of 'Change Proneness'.

5.12 Mobility of Teachers and Innovative Proneness

Table :5.69: Mobilitywise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Mobility	Number	Percentage
With Mobility	665	66.5
Without Mobility	335	33.5

This Table No. 5.69 shows numbers and percentage of teachers according to the Mobility of teachers.

Out of 1000 teachers, six hundred and sixtyfive teachers are 'With Mobility' and three hundred and thirtyfive 'Without Mobility' and their percentages are 66.5% and 33.5% respectively.

Mean differences are computed according to three sections of 'The Innovative Proneness Scale' and also according to its twentyone components.

Table :5.70: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Mobility	Mean	SD	t value
With Mobility	535.32	78.78	1.87 NS
Without Mobility	545.34	81.98	

This Table 5.70 shows mean score and 't' value between Mobile and Immobile teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools as a whole. The mean difference is in favour of teachers 'Without Mobility' but it is not significant.

Table :5.71: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Attitudes to Innovation

Mobility	Mean	SD	t value
With Mobility	116.53	20.82	1.86 NS
Without Mobility	119.16	21.61	

The above Table 5.71 shows the 't' value between Mobile and Immobile teachers in context of 'Attitudes to Innovation'. Mobility has nothing to do with attitude of teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary schools towards Innovations as 't' value is not significant.

The Table No. 5.72 given on the next page gives componentwise 't' values of 'Mobile and Immobile' teachers on 'Attitudes to Innovation'.

Table :5.72: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Components	With Mobility		Without Mobility		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualisation	20.64	3.84	20.58	4.29	0.22 NS
2. Curriculum Organization	11.91	3.21	12.39	2.87	2.33 *
3. Teaching Learning Process	19.92	4.18	20.65	4.10	2.60 **
4. Teaching Resources	15.05	3.72	15.36	6.05	1.00 NS
5. Internal School Organisation	18.60	4.33	19.18	4.34	2.04 *
6. Staff Development	18.89	4.39	19.22	4.43	1.11 NS
7. School Community Relationship	11.47	3.02	12.12	3.16	3.17 **

** Significant at 0.01 level
* Significant at 0.05 level
NS Not Significant

In the case of 'School Community Relationship' and 'Teaching Learning Process', 't' values are highly significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of the teachers without mobility in both the components.

In the case of 'Curriculum Organisation' and 'Internal School Organisation', 't' values are significant at 0.05 level. The mean differences are in favour of teachers without mobility.

The rest of the 't' values are not significant.

Table :5.73: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Mobility	Mean	SD	t Value
With Mobility	204.92	40.73	
			0.33 NS
Without Mobility	204.02	41.03	

The above Table 5.73 shows insignificant 't' value between 'Mobile and Immobile' teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools in the context of 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics' taken together.

Table No. 5.74 reproduced on the next page gives componentwise, 't' values of 'Mobile' and 'Immobile' teachers. All the values are insignificant.

This means that 'Mobility of teachers' doesn not have significant difference on any of the components of eight 'Situational Characteristics or Innovation Characteristics'.

Table :5.74: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	With Mobility		Without Mobility		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Administrative Support	26.88	7.76	27.30	6.4	0.90 NS
2. Staff Norms	33.43	14.45	34.33	14.62	0.92 NS
3. System Norms	16.71	7.15	17.17	7.58	0.95 NS
4. Complexity	22.19	5.70	21.75	5.22	1.18 NS
5. Compatibility	22.64	5.58	22.18	5.35	1.23 NS
6. Riskness	32.40	7.05	31.69	6.64	1.53 NS
7. Localiteness	32.91	6.76	31.99	6.91	2.03 NS
8. Cosmopoliteness	17.49	7.04	17.79	7.26	0.63 NS

NS Not Significant

Table :5.75: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Change Related Values

Mobility	Mean	SD	t value
With Mobility	213.89	36.16	3.46 **
Without Mobility	222.43	38.27	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

Table No. 5.75 shows that the 't' value on 'Change Related Values' is highly significant at 0.01 level. The mean difference is in favour of 'Without Mobility' types of teachers.

Table :5.76: Mobility of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Change Related Values

Components	With Mobility		Without Mobility		t Value	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1. Individualisation	38.87	7.30	38.83	6.55	0.10	NS
2. Progressivism	38.91	7.20	39.85	7.27	1.95	NS
3. Dogmatism	31.83	9.36	33.81	8.18	3.28	**
4. Venturesomeness	32.91	7.65	33.76	7.90	1.63	NS
5. Conservatism	29.99	9.21	32.76	8.40	4.62	**
6. Change Proneness	41.42	8.16	41.36	7.57	0.12	NS

NS Not Significant ** Significant at 0.01 level

The above Table 5.76 gives significant t values, significant at 0.01 level in the case of two components 'Dogmatism' and 'Conservatism'. Mean difference is in favour of 'Without Mobility' type of teachers.

The rest of the t values are not significant.

5.13 In-service Education of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.77: In-service Educationwise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

In-service Education	Number	Percentage
Some In-service Education	668	66.8
None In-service Education	332	33.2
Total	1000	100.0

The above Table 5.77 shows the numbers and percentage of the teachers having some In-service Education and None In-service Education.

Out of 1000 teachers, 668 teachers are having some In-service Education and 332 teachers are having 'None In-service Education'.

Table :5.78: In-service Education and Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

In-service Education	Mean	SD	t Value
Some In-service Education	544.70	81.43	
			3.40 **
None In-service Education	526.55	75.62	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

The Table 5.78 shows the mean difference of teachers having some In-service Education and None In-service Education as a whole.

Mean difference is in favour of 'Some In-service Education' and it is highly significant at 0.01 level.

It shows that teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools some with In-service Education play highly significant role in Innovative Proneness as a whole.

Table :5.79: In-service Education of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Attitude to Innovation

In-service Education	Mean	SD	t Value
Some In-service Education	118.49	20.88	2.29 *
None In-service Education	115.25	21.43	

* Significant at 0.5 level

The above Table 5.79 gives the 't' values of teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools with 'Some In-service Education' and 'None In-service Education' in terms of 'Attitude to Innovation'.

This Table shows that the 't' value is significant at 0.05 level. It means the difference between In-service Education and 'Attitude to Innovation' is significant

and the mean difference is in favour of the teachers having 'Some In-service Education' in the case of 'Attitudes to Innovation' as a whole.

Table :5.80: In-service Education of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Components	Some In-service Education		None Inservice Education		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualisation	20.67	3.86	20.51	4.25	0.61 NS
2. Curriculum Organisation	12.46	2.65	11.30	3.74	5.65 **
3. Teaching-Learning Process	20.19	4.08	20.11	4.35	0.28 NS
4. Teaching Resources	15.19	3.77	15.01	6.02	0.29 NS
5. Internal School Organisation	19.01	4.46	18.37	4.06	2.19 *
6. Staff Development	19.20	4.26	18.60	4.66	2.03 *
7. School Community Relationship	11.77	3.07	11.51	3.10	1.27 NS

* Significant at 0.05 level NS Not Significant
** Significant at 0.01 level

The above Table 5.80 shows the mean differences are in favour of the teachers having some In-service Education, compared to those having None In-service Education. In the case of 'Internal School Organisation, Staff Development and Curriculum Organisation', which is significant at 0.05 level for the first two components and at 0.01 level for the third component

respectively mentioned in this paragraph.

It means In-service Education have significant mean difference on 'Internal School Organisation', 'Staff Development' and 'Curriculum Organisation'. In the case of other components mean differences are in favour of 'Some In-service Education' of teachers but they are insignificant. So general conclusion is 'In-service Education' of teachers does play a significant role in 'Attitude to Innovation'.

Table :5.81: In-service Education of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Category of Teachers	Mean	SD	t Value
Some In-service Education	207.79	40.19	3.51 **
None In-service Education	198.24	41.37	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

In the aboveTable 5.81, the mean difference is in favour of the teachers having some In-service Education on 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics', and it is highly significant at 0.01 level. It can be inferred that In-service Education has highly favourable mean on 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics'.

Table :5.82: In-service Education of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Some In-service Education		None In-service Education		t Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Administrative Support	27.37	7.05	26.28	7.82	2.22 *
2. Staff Norms	34.70	14.49	31.78	14.37	3.01 **
3. System Norms	17.20	7.12	16.21	7.59	2.02 *
4. Complexity	22.41	5.30	21.30	5.95	2.97 **
5. Compatibility	23.23	4.99	20.98	6.15	6.22 **
6. Riskness	32.03	6.62	32.43	7.49	0.86 NS
7. Localiteness	32.38	6.85	33.05	6.74	1.47 NS
8. Cosmopoliteness	18.27	6.87	16.23	7.40	4.31 **

* Significant at 0.05 level NS Not Significant
** Significant at 0.01 level

The above Table 5.82 shows that the mean difference is significant at 0.01 level in the case of 'Staff Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, and Cosmopoliteness', which is in favour of 'Some In-service Education' of teachers. This shows that these components are highly significant and in favour of In-service Education of teachers.

There iare significant 't' values at 0.05 level in the case of 'Administrative Support' and 'System Norms'. The

significant mean differences are in favour of the teachers with 'Some In-service Education'. This means that Inservice Education of teachers play a significant rule in these components.

In the case of 'Riskness' and 'Localiteness' t values are not significant.

Table :5.83: Inservice Education of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Change Related Values

Category of Teachers	Mean	SD	t Values
Some In-service Education	218.64	37.87	2.29 *
None In-service Education	212.96	35.19	

* Significant at 0.05 level

In the Table 5.83 above, the mean difference is significantat 0.05 level.

The significant mean difference on 'Change Related Values' is in favour of the teachers with 'Some In-service Education'. It means that In-service Education of Teachers has significant bearing on Change Related Values.

Table :5.84: In-service Education of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Change Related Values

Components	Some In-service Education		None in-Service Education		t Values
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalism	39.05	7.17	38.46	6.83	1.24 NS
2. Progressivism	39.20	7.38	39.27	6.94	0.13 NS
3. Dogmatism	33.03	8.99	31.41	9.02	2.68 **
4. Venturesomeness	33.60	7.93	32.38	7.30	2.37 *
5. Conservatism	31.37	9.10	30.01	8.84	2.25 *
6. Change Proneness	41.36	7.84	41.47	8.21	0.21 NS

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

This Table 5.84 gives the 't' values of teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools according to the components of 'Change Related Values'.

In the case of 'Dogmatism', there is highly significant mean difference at 0.01 level, which is in favour of teachers having 'Some In-service Education'.

Further this Table shows that there are significant 't' values in the case of 'Venturesomeness' and 'Conservatism' at 0.05 level. Mean difference is in favour

of teachers having some Inservice- Education.

The rest of the 't' values of other components are not significant.

5.14 Professional Reading Habits of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.85: Professional Reading Habitwise in General Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Reading Habits	Number	Percentage
Some Reading Habits	765	76.5
None Reading Habits	235	23.5
Total	1000	100.00

The above Table 5.85 shows the numbers of teachers having some reading habits and none reading habits.

Out of 1000 teachers, 765 teachers have Some Reading Habits and 235 are having None Reading Habits and their percentages are 76.5 and 23.5 respectively.

Table :5.86: Professional Reading Habits of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Reading Habits	Mean	SD	t Values
Some Reading Habits	543.34	81.20	3.35 **
None Reading Habits	523.49	73.95	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

This Table 5.86 shows mean difference of the teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools with Professional Reading Habits on Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

Mean difference is in favour of the teachers having some reading habits. It is highly significant at 0.01 level.

It shows that the teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools having a habit of reading professional literature show the level of significance on 'Innovative Proneness as a whole.

Table :5.87: Professional Reading Habits of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and 'Attitude to Innovation'.

Reading Habits	Mean	SD	t Value
Some Reading Habits	118.60	20.42	3.23 **
None Reading Habits	113.55	22.84	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

Table No. 5.87 shows highly significant mean difference on 'Attitude to Innovation' in favour of the teachers who are in touch with recent trends in the field of education through the reading of professional literature, 't' value is highly significant.

Attitude to Innovation yields highly favourable and significan mean difference on the teachers having some reading habit.

Table :5.88: Professional Reading Habits of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Attitude to Innovation

Components	Some Reading Habits		None Reading Habits		t Values
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualisation	20.79	3.91	20.06	4.20	2.46 *
2. Curriculum Organi-zation	12.26	2.98	11.46	3.42	3.48 **
3. Teaching-Learning Process	20.24	4.12	19.93	4.31	1.00 NS
4. Teaching Resources	15.28	4.83	14.77	3.89	1.48 NS
5. Internal School Organisation	18.91	4.27	18.43	4.55	1.48 NS
6. Staff Development	19.30	4.25	18.04	4.76	3.86 **
7. School Community Relationship	11.79	2.87	11.35	3.66	1.95 NS

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

From Table 5.88 it appears that the teachers with a habit of reading professional literature are significantly high on 'Curriculum Organisation' and 'Staff Development' at 0.01 level and they are significantly high at 0.05 level on 'Individualisation'. This means a habit of reading professional literature does make a significant difference on 'Attitude to Innovation'.

Table :5.89: Professional Reading Habits of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Reading Habits	Mean	SD	t Values
Some Reading Habits	207.46	41.48	
			4.00 **
None Reading Habits	195.36	37.16	

** Significant at 0.01 level

From this Table 5.89 it appears that mean difference is in favour of the teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools having some Reading Habits.

Its 't' value is highly significant. It means 'Situational and Innovation Characteristics' received highly significant and favourable mean/difference from the teachers having Some Reading Habits.

Table :5.90: Professional Reading Habits of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Some Reading Habits		None Reading Habits		t Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Administrative Support	26.97	7.6	27.12	6.41	0.27 NS
Staff Norms	34.53	14.47	31.15	14.37	3.14 **
System Norms	17.39	7.24	15.16	7.24	4.14 **
Complexity	22.26	5.72	21.32	4.89	2.27 *
Compatibility	23.03	5.43	20.72	5.39	5.72 **
Riskness	32.41	6.94	31.35	6.82	2.05 *
Localiteness	31.92	6.84	31.59	6.65	2.61 **
Cosmopoliteness	17.81	7.12	16.89	7.05	1.74 NS

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

From the above Table 5.90, it appears that the mean differences of 'Staff Norms, System Norms, Compatibility, Localiteness' are in favour of the teachers with Some Reading Habits and t-values are highly significant at 0.01 level. Means these components receive highly significant and favourable mean difference from the teachers having Reading Habits. Further it appears that the mean difference of 'Complexity and Riskness' have significant mean difference in favour of the teachers with

Some Reading Habits. Its t-values are significant.

Further we can see that the rest of the values are not significant.

Table :5.91: Professional Reading Habits of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers and Change Related Values

Reading Habits	Mean	SD	t Values
Some Reading Habits	217.43	36.23	
			1.04 NS
None Reading Habits	214.55	39.71	

NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.91 shows insignificant t values on 'Change Related Values.' This means 'Professional Reading Habit' does not make significant difference with 'Change Related Values'.

Table :5.92: Professional Reading Habits of Secondary and Higher Secondary Teachers and Components of Change Related Values

Components	Some Reading Habits		None Reading Habits		t Values
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalism	39.43	6.99	37.00	6.98	4.66 **
2. Progressivism	39.32	7.01	38.92	7.92	0.74 NS
3. Dogmatism	32.57	9.35	32.35	7.92	0.47 NS
4. Venturesomeness	33.59	7.76	31.92	7.56	2.90 **
5. Conservatism	30.95	9.40	30.82	7.77	0.20 NS
6. Change Proneness	41.70	7.62	40.42	8.93	2.15 *

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

The Table 5.92 gives significant, highly significant and not significant t-values of components of Change Related Values.

This Table shows highly significant 't' values in the case of 'Traditionalism, Venturesomeness, and significant t values in the case of Change Proneness.

Mean differences are in favour of teachers having Some Reading Habits in cases of all components of Change Related Values. However, significant values are with Change Proneness and highly significant values are with 'Traditionalism' and 'Venturesomeness'.

The rest of the values are insignificant.

5.15 Professional Satisfaction of Teachers and Their Innovative Proneness

Table :5.93: Professional Satisfactionwise Distribution of Sampled Teachers

Professional Satisfaction	Number	Percentage
Highly Satisfied	811	81.1
Highly Unsatisfied	189	18.9
Total	1000	100.0

Table No. 5.93 above shows the number and percentage of teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Professional Satisfaction.

This Table shows that out of 1000 teachers, 811 teachers are highly satisfied and 189 teachers are highly unsatisfied and their percentage are 81.1% and 18.9% respectively.

Mean differences are computed according to the three sections of the 'Innovative Proneness Scale' and also according to its twentyone components.

Table :5.94: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Innovative Proneness as a Whole

Professional Satisfaction	Mean	SD	t Value
Highly Satisfied	543.29	79.55	3.80 **
Highly Unsatisfied	518.88	78.95	

** Highly Significant at 0.01 level

This Table 5.94 shows the mean difference in favour of Highly Satisfied teachers on 'Innovative Proneness' as a whole. It is highly significant.

Table :5.95: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Attitudes to Innovation

Professional Satisfaction	Mean	SD	t value
Highly Satisfied	118.03	20.86	1.92 NS
Highly Unsatisfied	114.76	22.01	

NS Not Significant

The above Table 5.95 gives 't' values of Highly Satisfied and Highly Unsatisfied teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools in terms of 'Attitude to Innovation'

Insignificant mean difference is in favour of highly satisfied teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary School teachers.

Table :5.96: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and the Components of Attitudes to Innovation

Components	Highly Satisfied		Highly Un-Satisfied		t Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Individualisation	20.67	3.96	20.39	4.14	0.88 NS
2. Curriculum Organisation	12.06	3.05	12.14	3.32	0.34 NS
3. Teaching-Learning Process	20.26	4.15	19.75	4.24	1.54 NS
4. Teaching Resources	15.23	4.71	14.86	4.26	0.99 NS
5. Internal School Organisation	18.91	4.26	18.31	4.64	1.72 NS
6. Staff Development	19.15	4.37	18.37	4.50	2.19 *
7. School Community Relationship	11.83	3.12	11.07	2.81	3.08 **

* Significant at 0.05 level NS Not Significant
** Significant at 0.01 level

From the Table No. 5.96, it appears that 'Attitudes to Innovation' of teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary schools componentwise, the mean difference on 'Staff Development', is significant at 0.05 level and mean difference on 'School Community Relationship' is highly significant at 0.01 level. The mean differences are in favour of satisfied teachers.

Further mean difference is in favour of highly satisfied teachers in the case of 'Individualisation, Teaching Learning Process, Teaching Resources and Internal School Organisation and highly unsatisfied teachers in the case of 'Curriculum Organisation', but the 't' values are insignificant.

Table :5.97: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Professional Satisfaction	Mean	SD	t Value
Highly Satisfied	207.36	40.38	4.44 **
Highly Unsatisfied	192.85	40.69	

** Highly significant at 0.01 level

Table No. 5.97 indicates that the mean difference is in favour of highly satisfied teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools on 'Situational Characteristics and Innovation Characteristics'. It is highly significant.

Table :5.98: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Situational and Innovation Characteristics

Components	Highly Satisfied		Highly Unsatisfied		t Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1.Administrative Support	27.44	7.33	25.14	7.07	3.91 **
2.Staff Norms	34.34	14.46	31.15	14.48	2.73 **
3.System Norms	17.1	7.39	15.86	6.80	2.10 *
4.Complexity	22.22	5.49	21.26	5.74	2.15 *
5.Compatibility	22.68	5.50	21.64	5.46	2.33 *
6.Riskness	32.53	6.65	30.59	7.82	3.48 **
7.Localiteness	32.98	6.55	30.96	7.68	3.69 **
8.Cosmopoliteness	17.84	7.22	16.55	6.56	2.24 *

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

From the Table 5.98, it appears that significant mean difference is in favour of highly satisfied teachers.

Mean difference is highly significant at 0.01 level in case of 'Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Riskness and Localiteness'.

Further in the case of 'System Norms', Complexity, Compatibility and Cosmopoliteness', the mean differences are significant at 0.05 level.

Table :5.99: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Change Related Values

Professional Satisfaction	Mean	SD	t Value
Highly Satisfied	218.05	37.11	
			2.30 *
Highly Unsatisfied	211.18	36.54	

* Significant at 0.05 level

According to the Table 5.99 above on 'Change Related Values', the significant mean difference is in favour of highly satisfied teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools. It is significant at 0.05 level.

It can be said that the Change Related Values receive significant and favourable means from the satisfied teachers.

Table :5.100: Professional Satisfaction of Teachers of Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools and Components of Change Related Values

Components	Highly Satisfied		Highly Unsatisfied		t Value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Traditionalism	38.88	7.00	38.78	7.33	0.18 NS
2. Progressivism	39.60	7.22	37.59	7.09	3.46 **
3. Dogmatism	32.55	9.11	32.26	8.7	0.40 NS
4. Venturesomeness	33.38	7.83	32.42	7.32	1.53 NS
5. Conservatism	30.75	9.15	30.68	8.50	1.28 NS
6. Change Proneness	41.94	7.7	39.09	8.66	4.48 **

** Highly significant at 0.01 level
NS Not Significant

This Table 5.100 shows that on 'Progressivism' and 'Change Proneness', highly significant mean differences are in favour of satisfied teachers. In other cases, also the mean differences are in favour of satisfied teachers, but they are not significant.

5.16 Correlation Matrix of the Components of Innovative Proneness and the Personal Variables of Teachers

From the correlation matrix (Table 101), it appears that 'age' of the teachers is highly and significantly correlated with ~~Individualisation~~, Curriculum Organisation,

CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE COMPONANTS OF INNOVATIVE PRONENESS AND THE PERSONAL VARIABLES OF TE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
1		·57	·63	·28	·46	·54	·43	·72	·26	·02	·05	·31	·35	·36	·31	·10	·29	·25	·37	·08	·22	-·06	·50	·28	·49	·37	·33	·21	·26	·24	·25	·18	·33	·14	-·08	-·01
2			·53	·30	·43	·52	·43	·64	·19	·21	·05	·25	·33	·40	·20	·10	·25	·22	·35	·10	·26	-·08	·43	·29	·45	·28	·39	·19	·26	·15	·23	·10	·26	·13	-·05	·01
3				·43	·60	·62	·55	·79	·23	-·09	·12	·24	·24	·34	·39	·05	·21	·35	·47	·15	·34	-·02	·50	·40	·53	·27	·25	·24	·19	·17	·18	·17	·27	·10	-·02	-·02
4					·40	·50	·38	·65	·22	·04	·03	·22	·19	·20	·25	·14	·22	·19	·29	·13	·18	-·01	·23	·24	·38	·14	·13	·14	·13	·11	·10	·05	·14	·04	·11	·08
5						·70	·50	·78	·36	·06	·11	·37	·30	·38	·32	·16	·35	·34	·51	·21	·26	·03	·40	·40	·59	·16	·15	·15	·11	·14	·13	·06	·16	·13	·043	·09
6							·62	·84	·35	·05	·10	·41	·40	·48	·44	·25	·41	·32	·52	-·22	·33	-·02	·46	·43	·66	·21	·22	·15	·12	·09	·12	·02	·12	·10	·07	·10
7								·71	·21	·03	·0·0	·30	·30	·33	·33	·11	·26	·36	·47	·25	·33	·07	·41	·43	·54	·13	·15	·17	·13	·08	·06	·10	·16	·09	- ·01	- ·02
8									·33	·01	·08	·39	·39	·45	·44	·18	·37	·37	·56	·22	·27	-·03	·54	·46	·68	·29	·27	·24	·21	·18	·19	·13	·26	·11	·01	·05
9										·46	·43	·42	·42	·21	·18	·50	·71	·12	·19	·17	·23	·01	·26	·22	·57	·12	·09	·10	·09	·09	·09	·04	·12	·14	·03	·16
10											·72	·31	·25	-·10	·06	·55	·73	·16	·03	·30	·28	·35	·03	·23	·49	-·17	- ·02	- ·06	- ·03	- ·02	- ·02	- ·01	- ·08	·04	·08	·18
11												·39	·27	-·04	·02	·58	·72	·13	·00	·26	·25	·30	·02	·20	·45	- ·18	- ·01	- ·03	- ·04	·01	·00	·00	-·07	·55	·10	·17
12													·50	·50	·38	·30	·70	·25	·33	·17	·26	·02	·38	·31	·62	·06	·19	·09	·07	·12	·09	·02	-·13	·14	- ·02	·01
13														·55	·37	·34	·67	·21	·29	-·06	·18	-·08	·39	·23	·56	- ·01	·08	·07	·03	- ·02	- ·03	- ·07	- ·01	·08	·07	·02
14															·64	·01	·42	·32	·40	·09	·19	- ·12	·48	·28	·48	·12	·13	·1	·10	0·8	·1	·07	·13	·10	-·15	·03
15																·03	·39	·30	·38	·18	·29	- ·02	·40	·33	·48	·11	·13	·12	·03	·11	·12	·11	·11	·05	-·07	-·11
16																	·67	·09	·12	·30	·33	·28	·11	·29	·54	·01	-·01	·05	·08	·08	·10	·08	·07	·3	·10	·19
17																		·29	·26	·32	·39	·20	·34	·39	·81	·12	·03	·02	·02	·05	·04	·03	·04	·12	·01	·14
18																			·60	·53	·57	·41	·54	·76	·62	·11	·10	·03	·02	·05	·08	·11	·11	·11	·06	·01
19																				·43	·52	·16	·65	·74	·65	·26	·19	·23	·14	·18	·17	·12	·23	·23	·01	·00
20																					·63	·6	·33	·72	·60	·5	·09	·21	- ·01	·07	·12	·11	·13	·13	·08	·04
21																						·51	·51	·81	·63	·07	·10	·03	- ·02	·00	·05	·05	·05	·07	·01	·03
22																							·06	·63	·40	·09	·01	·08	- ·08	- ·03	·03	·08	- ·03	·04	·11	·08
23																								·67	·65	·21	·17	·18	·16	·17	·19	·14	·25	·11	- ·10	- ·01
24																									·81	·15	·18	·22	·06	·12	·13	·14	·18	·16	·06	·04
25																										·16	·21	·18	·09	·13	·14	·11	·18	·11	·04	·10
26																											·55	·53	·52	·52	·52	·43	·74	·29	·03	·12
27																												·50	·49	·50	·55	·35	·69	·25	·00	·09
28																													·55	·63	·61	·60	·80	·26	·10	·13
29																														·61	·60	·54	·76	·29	·13	·20
30																															·65	·54	·80	·34	·20	·22
31																																·53	·80	·37	·13	·19
32																																	·69	·22	·08	·11
33																																		·37	·13	·20
34																																			·46	·48
35																																				·75
36																																				
37																																				
38																																				
39																																				
40																																				

TABLE: 101

REF:-
* SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL
** HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL

TRIX: OF THE COMPONANTS OF INNOVATIVE PRONENESS AND THE PERSONAL VARIABLES OF TEACHERS

10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
02	.05	.31	.35	.36	.31	.10	.29	.25	.37	08	.22	-.06	.50	.28	.49	.37	.33	.25	.26	.24	.25	.18	.33	.14	-.08	-.01	.14	.29	.28	.34
.21	.03	.25	.33	.40	.20	.10	.25	.22	.35	.10	.26	-.08	.3	.29	.45	.28	.39	.13	.26	.15	.23	.10	.26	.13	-.05	.01	.04	.11	.20	.18
.09	.02	.24	.24	.34	.39	-.05	.21	.35	.47	.15	.34	-.02	.50	.40	.53	.27	.25	.22	.19	.17	.18	.17	.27	.10	-.02	-.02	.15	.16	.24	.29
.04	.03	.22	.19	.20	.25	.14	.22	.19	.29	.13	.18	-.01	.23	.24	.38	.14	.13	.14	.13	.11	.10	.05	.14	.04	.11	.08	.12	.08	.14	.16
.00	.11	.37	.30	.38	.32	.16	.35	.34	.51	.21	.26	.03	.40	.40	.59	.16	.15	.15	.11	.14	.13	.06	.16	.13	.043	.09	.22	.12	.19	.17
.05	.10	.41	.40	.48	.44	.25	.41	.32	.52	.22	.33	-.02	.48	.43	.66	.21	.22	.15	.12	.09	.12	.02	.16	.10	.07	.10	.10	.07	.12	.13
.03	.00	.30	.30	.33	.33	.11	.26	.36	.47	.25	.33	.07	.41	.43	.54	.13	.15	.17	.13	.08	.06	.10	.16	.09	-.01	-.02	.05	.02	.10	.13
.01	.08	.39	.39	.45	.44	.18	.37	.37	.56	.21	.37	-.03	.54	.46	.68	.29	.27	.24	.21	.18	.19	.13	.26	.11	.01	.05	.17	.16	.25	.26
.46	.43	.42	.42	.21	.18	.30	.71	.12	.19	.17	.23	.01	.26	.22	.57	.12	.09	.10	.09	.09	.09	.04	.12	.14	.03	.16	.11	.09	.11	.07
	.72	.31	.25	-.18	.06	.55	.73	.16	.83	.30	.28	.35	.03	.23	.49	-.17	-.02	-.06	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.01	-.02	.04	.08	.18	.00	.00	-.04	-.09
		.39	.27	-.04	.02	.58	.2	.1	.50	.16	.25	.30	.02	.20	.49	-.18	-.01	-.03	-.06	.0	.0	.0	-.07	.55	.10	.17	.52	.01	-.03	-.07
			.67	.50	.38	.30	.70	.25	.33	.17	.25	.07	.38	.31	.12	.06	.19	.09	.07	.12	.08	.02	.13	.14	-.02	.01	.13	.14	.06	.04
				.55	.37	.34	.67	.21	.29	.05	.18	-.08	.39	.23	.56	-.01	.08	.07	.03	-.02	-.03	-.07	-.01	.08	.7	.02	-.03	.03	.01	-.01
					.64	.01	.42	.32	.40	.09	.19	-.12	.48	.28	.48	.12	.13	.3	.10	.08	.1	.07	.13	.10	-.15	.09	.06	.05	.15	.39
						.03	.39	.30	.38	.18	.2	-.02	.40	.33	.48	.11	.13	.12	.03	.11	.12	.1	.1	.05	-.07	-.11	.16	.12	.20	.18
							.67	.09	.12	.30	.33	.28	.11	.29	.54	.01	-.01	-.05	-.08	-.08	-.10	.08	.07	.3	-.10	.19	.00	-.12	-.05	.08
								.29	.25	.32	.39	.20	.34	.39	.81	.02	.09	.02	.02	.05	.1	.03	.04	.12	.01	.14	.09	.05	.06	.01
									.60	.53	.57	.41	.54	.76	.62	.11	.10	.09	.02	.05	.06	.1	.11	.11	.06	.01	.17	.13	.12	.15
										.43	.52	.16	.65	.70	.65	.16	.19	.23	.14	.18	.7	.12	.13	.23	.07	.00	.20	.12	.16	.23
											.63	.16	.33	.78	.60	.5	.09	.21	-.01	.07	.12	.1	.13	.13	.08	.04	.16	.06	.13	.09
												.51	.51	.81	.69	.07	.10	.09	-.02	.0	.05	.05	.05	.07	.03	.03	.08	.07	.15	.15
													.06	.63	.40	.09	.01	.08	-.08	-.03	-.03	.08	-.03	.04	.1	.08	.09	.0	.01	-.02
														.67	.65	.29	.27	.18	.16	.17	.19	.19	.25	.11	-.10	-.01	.14	.14	.18	.21
															.81	.19	.18	.22	.06	.12	.13	.14	.18	.16	.06	.04	.18	.10	.14	.15
																.16	.21	.18	.09	.13	.14	.11	.18	.17	.04	.10	.17	.12	.17	.16
																	.55	.53	.52	.52	.52	.43	.74	.29	.03	.12	.34	.34	.47	.52
																		.50	.49	.50	.55	.35	.69	.25	.00	.09	.26	.30	.32	.30
																			.55	.63	.61	.60	.80	.26	.10	.13	.39	.32	.43	.50
																				.61	.60	.54	.76	.29	.13	.20	.34	.39	.32	.36
																					.65	.54	.80	.34	.20	.22	.36	.31	.39	.40
																						.53	.80	.37	.13	.19	.46	.41	.41	.44
																							.69	.22	.08	.11	.35	.27	.34	.36
																								.37	.13	.20	.45	.43	.49	.53
																									.46	.48	.45	.42	.32	.32
																										.75	.33	.24	.02	.03
																											.42	.32	.10	.07
																												.66	.56	.51
																													.55	.56
																														.77

CODED VARIABLES (PERSONAL) — CONTINUOUS VARIABLES

	VARIABLES
1	SCHOOL
2	DISTRICT
3	TYPE
4	STREAM
5	AREA
6	CATAGORY
7	AGE
8	SEX
9	EXPERIENCE
10	ACADEMIC QUALIFICATION
11	PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION
12	MOBILITY
13	INSERVICE EDUCATION
14	PROFESSIONAL READING HABIT
15	PROFESSIONAL SATISFACTION
16	INDIVIDUALISATION
17	CURRICULUM ORGANIZATION
18	TEACHING LEARNING PROCESS
19	TEACHING RESOURCES
20	INTERNAL SCHOOL ORGANIZATION
21	STAFF DEVELOPMENT
22	SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP
23	ATTITUDES TO INNOVATION AS A WHOLE
24	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT
25	STAFF - NORMS
26	SYSTEM - NORMS
27	COMPLEXITY
28	COMPATIBILITY
29	RISKNESS
30	LOCALITENESS
31	COSMOPOLITENESS
32	SITUATIONAL & INNOVATION CHARACTERISTICS AS A WHOLE
33	TRADITIONALISM
34	PROGRESSIVISM
35	DOGMATISM
36	VENTURESOMENESS
37	CONSERVATISM
38	CHANGE PRONENESS
39	CHANGE RELATED VALUES AS A WHOLE
40	INNOVATIVE PRONENESS

Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation taken as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Riskness, Traditionalism, and also Innovative Proneness as a whole.

The age of teachers is correlated*significantly with Individualisation, Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole, Progressivism, and Change Related Values as a whole.

There is an insignificant negative correlation between 'age' of the teachers, Dogmatism, Venturesomeness.

'Sex' of the teacher is highly**and significantly correlated with Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, Attitudes to innovation of teachers taken as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopooliteness, the Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole, Traditionalism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a whole. Again Sex is significantly correlated with Progressivism at .05 level.

'Experience' of a teacher is highly and significantly correlated with Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation,

** Here highly correlated means correlated at 0.01 level
* Here correlated means correlated at 0.05 level.

Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, Attitudes of Teachers towards Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Venturesomeness.

There is a significant correlation between the 'Experience' and of the teachers and Complexity, Compatibility, Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, Conservatism, Change Proneness and Change Related values as a whole.

'Academic qualifications' of the teachers are highly and significantly correlated with Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, School Community Relationship, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, and Venturesomeness and highly and significantly negatively correlated with & 'System Norms'.

There is a negatively significant correlation between Academic qualifications of the teachers and Innovative Proneness as a whole.

'Professional qualifications' of teachers are highly and significantly correlated with Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Internal

School Organisation, Staff Development, School Community Relationship, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, ~~System Norms~~, Progressivism, Venturesomeness, and Conservatism and highly significantly negative correlationship with 'System Norms'.

'Mobility' of teachers is highly and significantly correlated with Individualism, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Complexity, Localiteness, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism and Change Proneness.

There is a significant correlation between 'Mobility' of the teachers, and Compatibility and Cosmopoliteness.

'In-service Education' of a teacher is highly and significantly correlated with Individualisation, Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Staff Development, Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms.

'Professional Reading Habit' of a teacher is highly and significantly correlated with Curriculum Organisation, Teaching Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Staff Development,

Attitudes to Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Complexity, Traditionalism, Change Related Values as a whole and negatively highly significantly correlated with School Community Relationship and Dogmatism. Again it is significantly correlated with Internal School Organisation, Riskness, Cosmopoliteness, Progressivism, and Innovative Proneness as a whole and there is a negatively correlation with Venturesomeness at .05 level of significance.

'Professional Satisfaction' of the teachers is highly significantly correlated with 'Curriculum Organisation, Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, Attitudes of Teachers towards Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Cosmopoliteness, the Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole, Traditionalism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, Change related values as a whole, and Innovative Proneness as a whole. Again, Professional Satisfaction is significantly correlated with System Norms, Localiteness and negatively and significantly correlated with Venturesomeness at .05 level of significance.

Individualisation is highly and significantly correlated with Curriculum Organisation, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, School Community

Relationship, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Progressivism, Venturesomeness, and negatively highly and significantly correlated with Change Proneness. Again Individualisation has a significant correlation with Teaching-Learning Process, Attitudes to Innovation as a Whole, Dogmatism and significantly negatively correlation with 'Cosmopoliteness'.

'Curriculum Organisation' of the teachers is highly significantly correlated with 'Teaching-Learning Process, Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, School Community Relationship, Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation as a Whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Progressivism, Venturesomeness. There is a significant correlation with Conservatism, and Complexity.

'Teaching-Learning Process' is highly and significantly correlated with Teaching Resources, Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, School Community Relationship, Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation as a Whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Conservatism, Change Proneness, Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

There is a significant correlation with System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole, Traditionalism and Progressivism.

'Teaching Resources' is highly and significantly correlated with Internal School Organisation, Staff Development, School Community Relationship, Attitudes of teacher towards Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, The Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change related values as a whole, and Innovative Proneness as a whole.

' Teaching Resources ' is not significant correlated with rest of the variables.

'Internal School Organisation' is highly and significantly correlated with Staff Development, School Community Relationship, Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Compatibility, Cosmopoliteness, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism, and Change related values as a whole. There is a significant correlation with Complexity, Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole and Innovative Proneness as a whole.

'Staff Development' is highly and significantly correlated with School Community Relationship, Attitudes of teachers towards Individualisation as a whole, Administrative Support, Staff Norms, Change related values as a whole, and Innovative Proneness as a whole.

There is a significant correlation with 'Compatibility'.

'School Community Relationship' is highly and significantly correlated with Administrative Support, Staff Norms and Dogmatism.

There is a significant correlation with Conservatism and negative significant correlation with System Norms.

'Attitudes of teachers towards Innovation' as a whole is highly and significantly correlated with Administrative Support, Staff Norms, System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, The Situational and Innovative Characteristics as a whole, Traditionalism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change related values as a whole and Innovative Proneness as a whole. Again it is significantly correlated with Progressivism.

There is a negative significant correlation with Dogmatism.

'Administrative Support' is highly and significantly correlated with Staff Norms, System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, The Situational

and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole and significant correlation with Change Proneness.

'Staff Norms' of the teachers is highly and significantly correlated with 'System Norms, Complexity, Compatibility, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

There is a significant correlation with riskness, Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole and Venturesomeness.

'System Norms' is highly and significantly correlated with Complexity, Compatibility, Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, the Situational and Innovative Characteristics as a Whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Venturesomeness, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole and Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

'Complexity' is highly and significantly correlated with 'Compatibility, Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, The Situational and Innovative Characteristics as a Whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole and Innovative Proneness as a Whole. There is a significant correlation with Venturesomeness

'Compatibility' is highly and significantly correlated with 'Riskness, Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, The Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Venturesomeness, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole and significant correlation with Dogmatism.

'Riskness' is highly and significantly correlated with Localiteness, Cosmopoliteness, The Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Dogmatism, Venturesomeness, conservatism Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

'Localiteness' is highly and significantly correlated with Cosmopoliteness, The Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Dogmatism, Venturesomeness, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole and Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

'Cosmopoliteness' is highly and significantly correlated with The Situational and Innovation Characteristics as a Whole, Traditionalism, Progressivism, Dogmatism, Venturesomeness, Conservatism, and Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

'The Situational and Innovation Characteristics' as a Whole is highly and significantly correlated with Traditionalism, Progressivism, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change Related Values as a Whole, and the Innovative Proneness as a Whole. Again it is significantly correlated with Venturesomeness.

'Traditionalism' is highly and significantly correlated with Progressivism, Dogmatism, Venturesomeness, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change related Values as a Whole and The Innovative Proneness as a whole.

'Progressivism' is highly and significantly correlated with Dogmatism, Venturesomeness, Conservatism, Change Proneness, The Change related values as a whole, and The Innovative Proneness as a Whole.

Dogmatism is highly and significantly correlated with Venturesomeness, Conservatism, Change Proneness.

'Venturesomeness' of a teacher is highly and significantly correlated with Conservatism, and Change Proneness and significantly correlated with Change Related values as a whole.

'Conservatism' of a teacher is highly and significantly correlated with Change Proneness, The change related values as a whole, and The Innovative Proneness as a whole.

'The Change Proneness' is highly and significantly correlated with The Change related values as a whole and the Innovative Proneness as a whole.

'The Change Related Values' as a whole is highly and significantly correlated with the Innovative Proneness as a whole.

5.17 Conclusion

In main, this chapter gives the findings of the present investigation as a result of the analysis and interpretation of the data. The main purpose of the present investigation being the construction and standardization and the application of the instrument to the Secondary and Higher Secondary schools teachers of the various districts of Gujarat with a view to finding out the Innovativeness as a whole and its various components in the context of their age, sex, experience, academic qualifications, professional qualifications, mobility, in-service education, professional reading habits, professional satisfaction, the whole chapter is designed accordingly.

So far as the various districts of Gujarat are concerned, the mean of the Innovative Proneness as a whole is the highest in 'Banaskantha' district and the lowest in 'Dang' district.

So far as the sex type of schools are concerned, the teachers working in the Girls' Schools give the highest mean score, Teachers working in the Boys' schools give the lowest

mean score and the teachers working in the mixed schools give the mean score on Innovative Proneness as a whole in between the means scores of the Girls' Schools and Boys' schools.

The teachers of the schools having Commerce stream give the highest mean score.

The teachers working in the Urban schools give the higher mean score than that of given by the teachers working in the schools of Rural areas.

The majority of teachers fall into 'Moderate categories of Teachers'.

Teachers above 35 years of age give higher mean score than those of the teachers under 35 years of age.

Female teachers give the higher mean score than male teachers.

Teachers having more than five years of teaching experience manifest higher mean score than the teachers having less than five years of teaching experience.

Teachers possessing the M.Com. degree give the highest mean score on Innovative Proneness while teachers having B.Sc. degree give the lowest mean score.

It is strange to find that teachers having T.D. qualifications give the highest mean score and the teachers having B.T. qualifications give the lowest mean score on Innovative Proneness.

The teachers who have not changed the schools give higher mean score on Innovative Proneness than the teachers who have changed the schools.

Teachers who have attended some In-service Education programme give higher mean score as compared to the teachers who had not attended any In-service Education programme.

Teachers having Professional Reading Habits, and the teachers having Professional Satisfaction give higher mean scores than the teachers who are not in a habit of ✓ Reading Professional Literature and the teachers ✓ having no Professional Satisfaction respectively.

Among the various components of the Innovative Proneness scale the Inter Correlations are significant and the personal variables of the teachers are related significantly with most of the components of the Innovative Proneness scale devised and standardized by the investigator.

CHAPTER V

REFERENCES

Blommers Paul and Lindquist E.F., 'Elementary Statistical Methods in Psychology and Education,' State University of Iowa.

Cochran, W.G., Sampling Techniques, 2nd ed. New York : John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.

Ezekjel, M. and K.Fox. Methods of Correlation and Regression Analysis, 3rd ed. New York : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.1959.

Ferguson, George A., 'Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education,' McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., New York, Toronto, London, 1959.

Guilford J.P.'Psychometric Methods', Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., Bombay - New Delhi.

Kendall, M.G. and W.R. Buckland. A Dictionary of Statistical Terms, 3rd ed. New York : Itafner Press, 1971.

Levin Richard I. 'Statistics for Management', Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi-110001, 1979.

Lindquist, E.F. : 'Statistical Analysis in Educational Research,' Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., Calcutta, Bombay, New York.

Snedecor, G.W., and W.G. Cochran. Statistical Methods. Sixth ed. Ames. Iowa, The Iowa State University Press, 1967.

Wagner, H.M.'Principles of Operations Research,'Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.