

Values and Personality traits of Aided and Self- Finance Teacher-Educators

Diwaker Sharma*¹ and Kavita Gupta²

¹SB-504, Gulmohur Tower, Chiranjeev Vihar, Ghaziabad.

²Mebar University, Ghaziabad.

*Email: Sharma_diwaker@rediffmail.com

Abstract

In the present paper researcher tried to differentiate the two groups (Teacher-Educators of aided college and Teacher-Educators of self finance college) on Values and Personality traits. The two groups were framed by random sampling and compared by using t test. Out of six values it was found that both the groups were either similar or partly on same tune on most values excepting the religious and social values but they were different on personality traits.

Keywords: Values, random, personality, aided

Teachers are the most important elements of the education system as they have more influence on educational programs and students than the other factors. The relationship between pupils and teachers is to some extent “symbiotic” (Kohoutek 2004). Competencies of teachers have become an important issue to be considered as the success of the education system depends mainly on the qualifications of teachers, who implement the system.

Teachers are the spreader of knowledge who helps pupils understanding, attitudes, skills, learning, and core values (Patrinis and Ruthkagia, 2007). Like all professions, teaching also has some unique values, norms and behaviors. These characteristics display the importance of determining some affective traits of student teachers throughout their training. The values that teachers have are effective on students along with their emotional reactions, challenging skills and field competence. Kilpatrick (1967) has rightly said “The teacher

must have as an essential part of his professional equipment what is called a ‘Map of Values’. With the help of such a map, daily decisions may be taken and resolved consistently with long range or short range destinations or decisions” in educational situations.

Values form an important element of the personality of individuals which influences their thought and behavior in an unconscious manner. They are normative standards by which human beings are influenced in the choice among alternative course of action. It is therefore very essential that teacher educators should develop such values in the pupil students that they become an asset and guide them to become individuals of sterling character who place service of the society above service of the self. As the student teachers are aware about the values they can prepare students in implying the values as per their demonstration.

Students usually pay attention to their teachers' approach to a topic rather than the instructed topic and are affected by their teachers' comments on the topic. It stated that "good teachers" possess positive personality characteristics and interpersonal skills (Getzels and Jackson, 1963). A teacher's positive or negative impression on students with his/her personality, attitude and behaviours depends on his/her field competence and pedagogical formation as well as beliefs and attitudes towards social values.

According to Dickson and Wiersma (1984) and Gibney and Wiersma (1986), there is ample evidence supporting the view that personality of a teacher is a very important determinant of successful teaching, and that teacher effectiveness is perceived to exist as a consequence of the characteristics of a teacher as a person.

Personal traits of teachers, their past and present professional experiences, issues they deal with, their relationship with their colleagues and administrators, their environment and the student profile they teach as well as their approaches to these elements are closely related to their affective characteristic. The teacher whose personality helps create and preserve a classroom or learning environment in which students feel contented and in which they are provoked to learn is said to have an enviable teaching personality (Callahan, 1966).

If a person has a sound personality he has a good virtue to cooperate with each other. Several studies have shown that regular exercise over a period of several years can change personality by increasing vitality; improving patience and humor, and making a person better tempered and more easy-going. They also show that high levels of fitness are often associated with high levels of self-assurance, self-confidence, and emotional stability.

Here the need to study the values and personality traits of teacher educators is that if they are good at these moral values their personality itself will demonstrate it. It will demonstrate to the student teacher which will be effective in forming their values. And finally their values demonstrated through their personality to the students who are the future of the society. Whatever importance teacher educators will give to certain values which have effect on their personality traits, have their effect on pupil teachers in their values and personality traits ultimately effects the students who forms the society and hence the nation.

But now a day there is very drastic difference between self finance institution and aided institutions. That is the reason that author decided to study the value and personality traits of self finance college and aided college teacher educators.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To study the value of male and female teacher educators.
2. To study the value of Govt. and Self finance college teacher educators.
3. To study the value of Govt. aided male teachers and self finance male teacher.
4. To study the value of Govt. aided female teachers and self finance female teacher.
5. To study the Personality Traits of male and female teacher educators.
6. To study the Personality Traits of Govt. aided and self finance college teacher educators.
7. To study the Personality Traits of Govt. aided male teachers and self finance male teacher.
8. To study Personality Traits of Govt. aided female teachers and self finance female teacher.

Hypotheses of the Study:

1. There is no significant difference in value of male and female teacher educators.
2. There is no significant difference in value of Govt. aided and self finance college Teacher educators.
3. There is no significant difference in value of Govt. aided male teachers and self finance male teacher.
4. There is no significant difference in value of Govt. aided female teachers and self finance female teacher.
5. There is no significant difference in Personality traits of male and female teacher educators.
6. There is no significant difference in personality traits of Govt. aided teachers and self finance teacher.
7. There is no significance difference in Personality

traits of Govt. aided male teachers and self finance male teacher.

8. There is no significance difference in Personality traits of Govt. aided female teachers and self finance female teacher.

Research Methodology

Method of research is sometimes determined by the theory of the topic under study, objectives of the study, and resources of the investigator. These considerations have led the investigator to use descriptive survey method. In the present investigation all the steps and characteristics have been used, which are essentials for the descriptive method of research.

Population and Sample:

The population for the purpose of this study has been defined as male and female teacher educators of government aided college and self- finance college of two districts i.e. Nainital and Almora. It was not possible to collect data from all the colleges of these districts, therefore simple random sampling was used by the researcher for conducting the research.

First of all researcher made the list of all colleges in two category. First he made the list of government aided colleges and secondly made the list of self finance college of two districts. Then he selected the name of college by lottery system and then visited to these colleges to collect the data.

Table 3.1. Nos. of samples of Teacher Educators

Types of College	Male	Female	Total
Self Finance College	30	35	65
Govt. Aided College	20	15	35
Total	50	50	100

Tools Used:

These tools were included for conducting the present study:

(1) Study of Value Test

Author : Dr. R.K. Ojha
 Year : 1992
 Publication : National Psychological Corporation
 4/230, Kacheri Ghat,
 Agra – 282004

(2) Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

Author : Dr. R.B. Cattell

Year : 1949

Statistical Technique used in the study

The choice of statistical techniques depending upon the nature of the distribution of scores and the hypothesis to be tested. Since the basic objectives of the study were to find out the significance differences between two comparable groups of teacher educators of government aided colleges and self financed colleges. So ‘t’ test was thought of as the most appropriate statistical technique which had been used to analysis the data.

Values with reference to Male and Female teacher educators:

Since the basic objectives of the study For testing the objective “to study the value of male and female teacher educators” researcher formed a hypothesis that there is no significant difference in values of male and female teacher educators “to test the hypothesis the researcher calculated the mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value both of male and female teacher educator which is shown in the Table No. 4.1.

Table 4.1. Mean, SD and t value of Male and Female Teacher Educators on Value

S. no.	Value	Male Teacher Educators		Female Teacher Educators		‘t’	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	44.88	4.87	44.86	3.78	0.022	NS
2	Economic	42.00	4.95	42.36	4.21	0.391	NS
3	Aesthetic	35.94	5.98	36.38	5.32	0.918	NS
4	Social	42.04	3.86	41.86	3.58	0.241	NS
5	Political	41.62	4.44	42.14	3.37	0.659	NS
6	Religious	33.68	5.15	32.9	5.41	0.104	NS

Interpretation

From the above table it is clear that on comparing the value of male and female teacher educators on different values the researcher find that there is no significant difference between male and female teacher educators on all values. So the

hypothesis has been accepted. It means teacher educators of both group are more or less same on the value.

Values with reference to Govt. Aided College Teacher Educators and Self Finance College teacher educators:

To test the hypothesis that “there is no significant difference between teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college” the researcher has calculated the Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ values of teacher educator of government aided college and self finance college which are shown in the Table No. 4.2

Table 4.2. Mean, SD & ‘t’ value of teacher educators of Govt. aided colleges and self finance colleges on Value

S. No.	Value	Govt. Aided College Teacher Educators		Self Finance College Teacher Educators		‘t’ Value	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	44.88	4.69	44.86	4.05	0.021	NS
2	Economic	42.08	5.53	42.23	4.01	0.141	NS
3	Aesthetic	35.25	5.07	36.64	5.80	1.242	NS
4	Social	42.94	3.17	41.41	3.88	2.125	Signi. at .05 level
5	Political	42.25	3.54	41.67	4.09	0.739	NS
6	Religious	32.80	5.21	33.55	5.14	0.690	NS

Interpretation

From the above table it is clear that the five value namely theoretical, economic, aesthetic, and political and religious do not differ significantly. The social value show significant difference.

The Mean value 42.94 (3.17) of teacher educator of government aided college was higher than the mean value 41.41 (3.88) of self finance college teacher educator and the ‘t’ value 2.125 was significant at .01 level. It indicates that social value is high in govt. aided college teacher educators than that of self- finance college teacher educators.

Values with reference to Govt. Aided College Male Teacher Educators and Self Finance College Male teacher educators:

To test the hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in values of male teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college” the researcher has calculated the Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ values of male teacher educator of government aided college and self finance college which are shown in the Table No. 4.3

Table 4.3. Mean, SD & ‘t’ value of male teacher educators of Govt. aided colleges and self finance colleges on Value

S. No.	Value	Govt. Aided College Male Teacher Educators		Self Finance College Male Teacher Educators		‘t’	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	45.05	5.28	44.76	4.45	0.202	NS
2	Economic	41.60	5.13	42.26	3.95	0.487	NS
3	Aesthetic	34.15	5.14	37.13	5.68	1.925	NS
4	Social	42.70	3.78	41.60	3.88	0.997	NS
5	Political	42.60	3.86	40.96	4.52	1.374	NS
6	Religious	34.30	5.57	32.26	5.28	1.295	NS

Interpretation

From the above table it is clear that all six values of male teacher educators of government-aided college and self finance college is found to have no significant difference. So the hypothesis has been accepted. It means that male teacher educator of both government-aided college and self finance college is more or less same on the value.

Values with reference to Govt. Aided College Female Teacher Educators and Self Finance College Female teacher educators:

To test the hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in values of female teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college” the researcher has calculated the Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ values of female teacher educator of government aided college and self finance college which are shown in the Table No. 4.4

Table 4.4. Mean, SD and ‘t’ value of female teacher educators of Govt. aided and self finance colleges on Value

S. No.	Value	Govt. Aided College Female Teacher Educators		Self Finance College Female Teacher Educators		‘t’ Value	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Theoretical	44.66	4.06	44.94	3.15	0.238	NS
2	Economic	42.73	4.53	42.20	4.06	0.391	NS
3	Aesthetic	36.73	3.60	36.23	5.85	0.368	NS
4	Social	43.26	2.08	41.25	3.89	2.385	Signi. at .05 level
5	Political	41.80	2.90	42.28	3.54	0.503	NS
6	Religious	30.80	4.60	33.88	5.47	1.995	Signi. at .05 level

Interpretation

From the above table it is clear that all the five values namely theoretical, economic, aesthetic, and political and religious do not differ significantly only the social value show significant difference.

The Mean value 43.26 (2.08) of female teacher educator of government aided college was higher than the mean value 41.25 (3.89), that of self finance college and the ‘t’ value 2.385 was significant at .05 level of significance.

Also the mean score 33.88(5.47) of female teacher educators of self – finance college was higher than the mean score 30.80 (4.60) of female teacher educators of government aided college and the ‘t’ value is 1.99 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance.

It indicates that the female teacher educators of government aided college are more social but are less religious as to the female teacher educators of self - Finance College.

Analysis regarding Personality traits

In the present study of personality traits of teacher educators along with values the personality traits has been defined in two parts that is personality and traits.

“Personality is the integration of those systems of habits that

represents an individual’s characteristic adjustment to his environments.”

Trait can be defined in words of Ross Stagner as “a generalized tendency to evaluate situations in a predictable manner and to act accordingly. Trait is some particular behaviour such as cheerfulness or self sacrifice which characteristics the individual in a wide range of activity and is fairly consistent over a period of time.

Personality Traits with reference to Male and Female teacher educators:

For testing the personality traits of teacher educators of government aided and self finance college the objectives was formed to study the personality traits of male and female teacher educators the researcher made a hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the personality traits of male and female teacher educator. To test this hypothesis the researcher has calculated the mean, S.D. and ‘t’ values of the male and female teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college which are shown in the Table No. – 4.5.

Table 4.5. Mean, SD & ‘t’ value of male and female teacher educators on Personality traits

S. No.	Personality Factors	Male Teacher Educators		Female Teacher Educators		‘t’	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	A	9.22	2.39	9.02	3.06	0.37	NS
2	B	9.28	3.14	9.52	3.28	0.38	NS
3	C	11.14	3.73	11.60	2.96	0.69	NS
4	E	11.16	3.14	10.54	3.11	0.99	Signi. at .01 level
5	F	10.80	3.76	10.70	3.22	0.14	NS
6	G	10.82	3.32	11.52	3.36	1.06	NS
7	H	12.14	3.67	11.98	3.50	0.22	NS
8	I	9.34	3.63	10.64	2.95	1.98	Signi. at .05 level
9	L	9.16	2.45	8.70	3.13	0.83	NS
10	M	12.10	3.01	10.08	2.99	3.42	Signi. at .01 level
11	N	9.56	3.08	10.22	3.30	1.06	NS
12	O	8.95	3.35	9.55	3.28	0.92	NS

13	Q ₁	8.51	2.60	8.92	3.26	0.72	NS
14	Q ₂	7.28	2.37	9.08	3.02	3.39	Signi. at .01 level
15	Q ₃	9.70	3.38	11.00	3.74	1.85	NS
16	Q ₄	8.38	3.06	8.64	3.37	0.41	NS

Interpretation:

It has been shown in the table 4.5 that out of sixteen personality factor, one factor viz. Harria (Tough minded, Realistic) vs Premsia (Tender minded, sensitive) show significant difference at 0.05 level of significance while the factor Praxernia vs Autia and Group adherence vs. self sufficiency show significant difference at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that mean score 10.64 (2.95) and 9.08(3.02) for the factors Harria vs. Premsia and Group adherence vs. self sufficiency respectively of female teacher educators is higher than the mean score 9.34 (3.63) 7.28(2.37) of male teacher

educators and goes in favour of female teacher educators. Also the mean score 12.01(3.01) for the factor Praxernia vs Autia of the male teacher educators is higher than that of female teacher educators.

This shows that female teacher educators are tender minded, practical and self – sufficient while the male teacher educators are tough – minded, imaginative and group- dependent.

Personality Traits with reference to Govt. Aided College Teacher Educators and Self Finance College teacher educators:

For testing the hypotheses that “there is no significant difference in personality traits of teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college”, the researcher has calculated the Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of government aided college and self finance college, which are shown in Table No. 4.6.

Table 4.6. Mean SD & ‘t’ value of teacher educators of Govt. aided and self finance colleges on Personality traits

S.No.	Personality Factors	Govt. Aided College Teacher Educators		Self Finance College Teacher Educators		‘t’ Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	A	8.54	2.70	9.44	2.26	1.76	NS
2	B	8.62	1.91	9.81	2.97	2.53	Signi. at .05 level
3	C	12.28	1.88	9.38	3.02	5.93	Signi. at .01 level
4	E	10.80	3.02	11.27	3.14	0.73	NS
5	F	10.08	3.09	11.10	3.53	1.52	NS
6	G	8.85	3.33	11.33	3.40	3.59	Signi. at .01 level
7	H	10.34	4.01	11.98	2.95	2.15	Signi. at .05 level
8	I	10.57	2.94	9.67	3.33	1.40	NS
9	L	7.80	3.32	9.46	2.36	2.67	Signi. at .01 level
10	M	9.97	3.03	11.46	3.04	2.36	Signi. at .05 level
11	N	8.77	3.22	10.40	3.10	2.50	Signi. at .05 level
12	O	8.51	3.04	9.56	3.17	1.64	NS
13	Q ₁	7.68	2.66	9.26	2.92	2.77	Signi. at .01 level
14	Q ₂	7.57	2.61	8.51	2.92	1.67	NS
15	Q ₃	8.68	3.66	11.24	3.20	3.55	Signi. at .01 level
16	Q ₄	8.60	4.17	8.61	2.99	0.01	NS

Interpretation

From the table 4.6 it is conducted that out of sixteen personality factors five factors viz. Lower ego strengths vs. higher ego strengths, Weaker super ego strengths vs. Stronger super ego strengths, Alaxia vs. Protension, Conservatism vs. Radical and Low integration vs. High self concept control show significant difference at 0.01 level of significance. While four factors viz. lower scholastic mental capacity vs. higher scholastic mental capacity, Threctia vs Parmia, praxernia vs Autia, Artlessness vs Shrewdness show significant difference at 0.05 level of significance.

It indicates that Mean score 12.28(1.88) for the factor Lower ego strengths vs. higher ego strengths teacher educators of govt. aided college is higher than mean score 9.38(3.02) teacher educators of self finance college at 0.01 level of significance. It shows that teacher educators of govt. aided college are emotionally stable while teacher educators of self finance college are emotionally less stable.

From this table it is clear that the factors namely Weaker super ego strengths vs. Stronger super ego strengths, Alaxia vs. Protension, Conservatism vs. Radical and Low integration vs. High self concept control go in favour of teacher educators of self finance college as the mean score of these factors namely Weaker super ego strengths vs. Stronger super ego strengths, Alaxia vs. Protension, Conservatism vs. Radical and Low integration vs. High self concept control of teacher educators of self finance college have mean score 11.33(3.40), 9.46(2.36), 9.26(2.92), 11.24(3.20) respectively which are higher than those of 8.85(3.33), 7.80(3.32), 7.68(2.66) and 8.68(3.66) respectively.

It indicates that teacher educators of self – finance college are Conscientious, self- opinionated, Liberal and socially precise while the govt. aided teacher educators Expedient, Adaptable, Respecting established and careless of protocol.

The table 4.6 stipulates that the mean scores 9.81(2.97), 11.98(2.95), 11.46(3.04) and 10.40(3.10) for the factors lower scholastic mental capacity vs higher scholastic mental capacity, Threctia vs Parmia, praxernia vs Autia, Artlessness vs Shrewdness respectively for self finance college are higher than the mean scores 8.62(1.91) 10.34(4.01), 9.97(3.03) and 8.77(3.22) of those factors for teacher educators of govt. aided college.

It indicates that teacher educators of self – finance college are abstract thinker, socially bold, imaginative, calculating while teacher educators of govt. aided college are concrete thinker, timid, practical and natural.

Personality Traits with reference to Govt. Aided College Male Teacher Educators and Self Finance College Male teacher educators:

To study the personality traits the researcher has made hypothesis and to test the hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the personality traits of male teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college” the researcher has calculated the Mean and S.D. and ‘t’ value of male teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college. It has been shown in the Table No. 4.7

Table 4.7. Mean, SD and ‘t’ value of male teacher educators of Govt. aided and self finance colleges on Personality traits

S.No.	Personality Factors	Govt. Aided College Male Teacher Educators		Self Finance College Male Teacher Educators		‘t’ Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	A	9.25	2.54	9.20	2.28	0.071	NS
2	B	9.35	2.93	9.23	2.83	0.172	NS
3	C	12.70	3.62	9.70	2.76	3.238	Signi. at .01 level
4	E	10.40	2.93	11.66	3.04	1.730	NS
5	F	10.70	2.98	10.86	4.20	0.158	NS
6	G	10.60	2.78	10.96	3.48	0.400	NS
7	H	12.65	3.64	11.80	3.62	0.810	NS
8	I	10.90	2.71	8.30	3.78	2.850	Signi. at .01 level
9	L	8.55	2.80	9.56	2.11	1.402	NS
10	M	11.35	2.95	12.60	2.78	1.520	NS
11	N	9.05	3.23	9.90	2.92	0.950	NS
12	O	8.45	3.08	9.20	3.48	0.806	NS
13	Q ₁	8.50	2.20	8.50	2.83	0	NS
14	Q ₂	6.55	2.03	7.76	2.43	1.950	NS
15	Q ₃	9.35	3.49	9.93	3.24	0.604	NS
16	Q ₄	8.55	3.49	8.26	2.73	0.310	NS

Interpretation

The Table 4.7 reveals that out of sixteen personality factors only two factors viz. lower ego strength vs. higher ego strength and Harria vs. Premsia show significant difference between the personality traits of male teacher educators of govt. aided college and self finance college.

The table stipulates that the mean score 12.70(3.62), 10.90(2.71) of male teacher educator of govt. aided college is higher than the mean score 9.70(2.76),8.30(3.78) of male teacher educator of self finance college for the factor lower ego strength vs. higher ego strength and Harria vs. Premsia respectively.

This indicates that of male teacher educator of govt. aided college are emotionally stable and dependent while male

teacher educator of self finance college are emotionally less stable and self – reliant.

Personality Traits with reference to Govt. Aided College Female Teacher Educators and Self Finance College Female teacher educators:

To test the hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the personality traits of female teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college” the researcher has calculated the Mean, S.D. of the female teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college, which has been shown in the Table No. – 4.8

Table 4.8. Mean, SD and ‘t’ value of female teacher educators of Govt. aided and self finance colleges on Personality traits

S.No.	Personality Factors	Govt. Aided College Female Teacher Educators		Self Finance College Female Teacher Educators		‘t’ Value	Remark
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	A	7.53	2.52	9.65	2.25	2.86	Signi. at .01 level
2	B	7.66	3.17	10.31	2.99	2.78	Signi. at .01 level
3	C	11.00	3.18	11.85	2.78	0.90	NS
4	E	9.60	3.17	10.94	3.05	1.41	NS
5	F	9.26	3.06	11.31	3.06	2.20	Signi. at .05 level
6	G	11.20	3.76	11.65	3.16	0.40	NS
7	H	11.60	4.36	12.14	3.03	0.43	NS
8	I	10.13	3.17	10.85	2.82	0.77	NS
9	L	7.13	3.01	9.37	2.54	2.54	Signi. at .05 level
10	M	9.13	2.94	10.28	2.92	1.27	NS
11	N	8.80	3.10	10.82	3.18	2.12	Signi. at .05 level
12	O	12.80	2.98	9.88	3.32	3.11	Signi. at .01 level
13	Q ₁	6.60	2.82	9.91	2.91	3.80	Signi. at .01 level
14	Q ₂	8.93	2.67	9.14	3.15	0.24	NS
15	Q ₃	7.80	3.69	12.37	2.80	1.05	NS
16	Q ₄	8.00	3.70	8.91	3.17	0.83	NS

Interpretation

The Table 4.8 show that out of sixteen personality factors only four factors viz. Sizothyrria vs. Affectothymia, lower vs. higher scholastic mental capacity, Untroubled Adequacy vs. Guilt Proneness, Conservatism vs. Radicalism show significant difference at 0.01 level of significance and three factors Desurgency vs Surgency, Alaxia vs Protension and Artlessness vs Shrewdness show the significant difference at 0.05 level of significance.

It indicates that the mean value 9.65(2.25), 10.31(2.99) and 9.91(2.91) of female teacher educator of self finance college is higher then mean value 7.53(2.52), 7.66(3.17) and 6.60(2.82) for the teacher educator of govt. added college for the factors viz. Sizothyrria vs. Affectothymia, lower vs. higher scholastic mental capacity, Conservatism vs. Radicalism at the 0.01 level of significance. And the mean value 12.80(2.98) of the female teacher educators of govt. aided college higher for is for the factor Untroubled Adequacy vs. Guilt Proneness

It can be concluded that the female teacher educators of self finance college are warm hearted, more intelligent, self-

assured and experimenting while female teacher educators of govt. aided college are reserved, less intelligent, Worrying and Conservative.

The mean score 11.31 (3.96), 9.37 (2.54) and 10.82 (3.18) of female teacher educators of self finance college are higher than the mean value 9.26 (3.06), 7.13 (3.01) and 8.8 (3.10) respectively of female teacher educators of govt. aided college for the factors Desurgency vs. Surgency, Alaxia vs Protension and Artlessness vs Shrewdness at 0.05 level of significance.

It shows that female teacher educators of self finance college are Sober, Trusting and Sentimental while female teacher educators of govt. aided college are happy-go-lucky, suspicious and penetrating.

Conclusion

The present study is done as to find out some conclusions regarding the values and personality factors of teacher educators of government aided college and self finance college. The process consists of various steps starting from

the data collection, its analysis and then interpretation and on the basis of which the researcher become able to draw a conclusion that out of six values only the social and religious values are significantly different and social values are prominently found in overall and female teacher educators of govt. aided college and the religious value found more in female teacher educators of self finance college.

On the other hand the all personality traits of female teacher educators are tender minded, practical and self – sufficient while the male teacher educators are tough – minded, imaginative and group- dependent. Teacher educators of self – finance college are Conscientious, self- opinionated, Liberal and socially precise while the teacher educators of govt. aided college are Expedient, Adaptable, Respecting, established and careless of protocol. Teacher educators of self – Finance College are abstract thinker, socially bold, imaginative, calculating while teacher educators of govt. aided college are concrete thinker, timid, practical and natural. Male teacher educator of govt. aided college are emotionally stable and dependent while male teacher educator of self finance college are emotionally less stable and self – reliant. Female teacher educators of self finance college are warm

hearted, more intelligent, self- assured and experimenting while female teacher educators of govt. aided college are reserved, less intelligent, worrying and Conservative.

References

- Kohoutek, R. (2004). Psychological Counseling at Universities and the relating Questions of Health In Řehulka, E.: Teachers and Health 6. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. p. 369-384. ISBN 978-80-7315-093-8.
- Harry Anthony Patrinos and Ruthkagia (2007): Maximizing the Performance of Education Systems The Case of Teacher Absenteeism published in The Many Faces of Corruption 63-87.
- William Heard Kilpatrick, Philosophy of education, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1951.
- Getzels, J. W. and Jackson, P. W. (1963). The teacher personality characteristic, In Gage, N. L. (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally
- Dickson, G. E. and Wiersma. W. (1984). Empirical Measurement of Teacher Performance, Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, the Centre for Educational Research and Services College of Education and Allied Profession.
- Callahan, S. G. (1996). Successful Teaching in Secondary Schools. Glenview, 111: Scott.