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Chapter I

**INTRODUCTION**

* **Need and significance**
* **Statement of the problem**
* **Variables**
* **Operation Definition of the key terms**
* **Objectives**
* **Hypothesis**
* **Methodology**
* **Scope and Limitation of the study**
* **Organisation of the Report**

Education enables a person to facilitate one’s duties and responsibilities to oneself, to the family, to the society and to the Nation and help to him live in a successful and meaningful life that inspire and guides the younger generation. Both the laypersons and professional educators believe firmly that effectiveness of an educational programme is largely determined by the quality of teachers as they interpret, imbibe and transmit knowledge and intellectual traditions from generation to generation. The importance of teacher in the process of education is of great value. “of all different factors, which influence the quality of education and its contribution to the national development, the quality , competence and characters of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant” (Indian Education Commission 1964-1966). In the words of Kothari D.S (1988) “the message of the teacher to the students is not merely to impart knowledge content of book, which is largely information fast getting out of date, but more than that it should be inspiration, by his/her example, towards the process of character building and the use of knowledge for welfare of the community. The total message to the students, and the community, is the total life of the teacher”.

The Indian Government lays emphasis on primary, secondary, higher secondary and higher education programmes. The primary education is also referred to as elementary education, to children aged six to fourteen years old. The Indian Government has also banned child labour in order to ensure that children do not enter unsafe working condition. However, both free education and the ban on child labour are difficult to enforce due to economic disparity and social condition. Eighty percentage of all recognized school at the elementary stage are Government run and supported, making it the largest provider of education in the country.

Secondary education covers children aged 14-18 a group comprising 88.5 million children according to the 2001 census of India. The final two years of secondary is often called Higher secondary (HS), Senior secondary, or simply the plus two stage. The two halves of secondary educations are each an important stage for which a pass certificate is needed, and thus are affiliated by Central Board of Education under HDR ministry, before one can pursue higher education, including, college or professional courses.

Curriculum is one of the fundamental elements of effective schooling and teaching. It is often the subject of reforms, most of which are broadly indented to either mandate or encourage greater curricular standardization and consistency across state, school, grade level, subject areas and courses.

The Secondary Education Commission headed by Dr. Lakshmana swami Muthaliar explicated the importance of secondary education. The report entitled ‘Education and National Development’. Submitted by the commission led by Dr. D.S. Kothari brought under study, various stages of education from the primary level to the higher education level. The 10+2+3 pattern was first proposed by this commission. The National Policy on Education 1986 approved this pattern. It was on the basis of this pattern that higher secondary education came in to existence in Kerala. In 1990 this saw a shift from the teacher centred curriculum to learner centred as well as activity based curriculum. The National Curriculum Frame work 2005 sowed the seed for many reforms in the field of education in India. Subsequently NCERT prepared textbooks for various subjects based on NCF 2005. Later the Kerala Curriculum Framework 2007 was formed and the curriculum up to high school level was revised. Then NCFTE 2009 was evolved for rejuvenating the teacher education programme.

**Higher Secondary Education**

The Department of Higher Secondary Education was formed consequent on de-linking pre-degree courses from college during 1990-1991. The de-linking of pre degree course from the college had resulted in surplus staff in three universities as well as in Department of Collegiate Education. With a view to redress the grievances of the above staff, surplus staff were posted in the Department of Higher Secondary Education by the Government. A large number of employees working in Calicut University and MG University had been posted at higher secondary directorate Thiruvananthapuram. The staffs so posted from the universities were in receipt of higher pay than that of the pay off the required post in the state Government. The inordinate delay on the part of the authorities in the General Education Department of the Secretarial resulted in the indefinite continuance of the deployed employees in the Department of Higher Secondary Education. They enjoyed regular promotions of their parent institutions at higher posts. Their services in the directorate were treated as on deputation and pro rata pension is being remitted to the concerned universities. The burden of payment of their pension was vested with the concerned universities. In the absence of special rules for non teaching staff, the posts of Assistant Director, Deputy Director, and Joint Director in the Directorate of Higher Secondary Education were also filled up by among the ministerial staff deployed from the universities. No post in any university is seen abolished consequent on the de-linking of pre degree course. It may be noted that the post of Assistant Director, Deputy Director and Joint Director should necessarily be filled up from among teaching staff in order to improve the quality and efficiency of higher secondary education.

State Government appointed a committee on to study the problems faced by higher secondary education in Kerala. Prof. POJ Labba was the Chairman of this committee. Pro. George Onakkoor, Sri. K.G Sukumarapillai were the members and Pro. K.A Hashim was the convener of this committee. A meeting was conducted at Calicut District, were the representatives of various higher secondary and vocational higher secondary teachers from different districts, parents, students, public are participated. The committee collected information from those groups. The main issues raised by the above parties are increase the electives in higher secondary education, equalise State Board with CBSE in its content, make Saturday as a holiday, identify the problems in administration etc.

After studying the problems of higher secondary education Labba committee submitted a report. The main recommendation of the committee was,

1. Five working days in a week
2. Change in the higher secondary examinations
3. Re arrange the student teacher ratio
4. Re arrange the double valuation
5. Ensure the effectiveness of academic performance
6. Reduce the work load of higher secondary principal
7. Provide training for Information Technology
8. Implement physical, health education
9. Importance given to arts
10. Special increment for higher qualified teachers
11. Counselling and career guidance for parents and teachers
12. Appoint clerk and peon
13. Fund for school- municipal and corporation area
14. Special fees in aided schools

Labba committee implemented the above given recommendations since July 2014 onwards. Even though some of the teachers were not ready to accept these recommendations. The main reason for this unwillingness is time factor, curriculum transaction, lack of adequate training programme etc. The main aim of conducting this research is to collect the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report.

**Need and Significance**

In pursuance of National Policy on Education the Government of Kerala established the Directorate of Higher Secondary Education in the year 1990. The directorate is envisaged as a central agency of the state Government seeking to promote all round development in higher secondary education by establishing appropriate philosophies, adequate institutional network, effective administrative system and well-qualified and motivated staff necessary to carry out academic and administrative responsibilities. Higher secondary education department conducts courses in science, commerce and humanities streams and also conducts the various higher secondary examinations for students of open schools, technical schools, kalamandalam, arts schools, school of Lakshadweep, Mahe and Gulf countries along with the students of higher secondary schools in Kerala. The department conducts examinations for the first year, as well as, for the second year in March. SAY (save a year) / improvement examinations are held in June, for enabling student, to save a year in case they fail in a single subject and supplementary examinations are also conducted in August. Every students under going higher secondary course, has to study six subjects. English language is compulsory with any one of the second language offered for higher secondary courses. Syllabuses prescribed by CBSE and NCERT text book are followed for English, subject under Science, Commerce and Humanities group.

The National Curriculum Frame work 2005 opines thus in this regard the possibilities of choosing optional courses of study for exploring and understanding different areas of knowledge, both in relation to one’s interest and one’s future career, is integral to this stage. Exploring displines and approaching problems and issues from rich inter disciplinary perspectives are possible at this stage. There is a need to allow for such investigations to take place between and outside the ‘subject’ chosen for study.

Labba committee report recommends setting up of an independent body on the lines of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) which would grade both private and Government higher secondary school. The working hours of the school was changed from the existing schedule and Saturday’s remains holiday for higher secondary schools.

For all round development of students, effective implementation of curriculum and good environment is must. As a teacher trainer the researcher had to visit many schools in Calicut and Malappuram districts. During such visit the researcher observed some difficulty in implementing Labba Committee Report. Being a novel one, Labba committee report poses a number of challenges to the facilitators with respect to the time schedule, work load of teachers, lack of interval, lack of infrastructural facility etc. It is very much necessary to suggest remedies or solution to the above mentioned problem and on the basis of study, necessary follow up activity have to be conducted.

This study focused on the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report. The study analysed their opinion towards the committee report on the basis of various dimensions.

**Statement of the problem**

According to Labba Committee Report the curriculum, syllabus and text books being followed for more than five years should be revised and reformed urgently by SCERT. But it was so sad that we have been following the traditional and unscientific system of overloaded curriculum along with outdated methods of teaching. Based on various criticisms, Kerala Government appointed a committee to revise the existing system of higher secondary education under the chairmanship of Pro. POJ Labba. Through this study investigator analyses ‘Opinion of Higher Secondary School Teachers towards Labba Committee Report’.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Opinion**

An opinion is a person’s idea and thought towards something which is either impossible to verify or against the existing facts. It is a belief or judgement that falls short of absolute conviction, certainty or positive knowledge, it is a conclusion that certain facts, idea etc.

**Higher secondary school teachers**

Higher secondary school teachers are those teachers they imparting instruction to XI and XII classes.

**Labba committee report**

A committee constituted by state government to examine the problems in higher secondary education and suggest remedial measures.

**Objectives of the study**

1. To analyse the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on infrastructural facility, curriculum, teachers professional development, students academic excellence and evaluation system.
2. To list the problems faced by higher secondary school teachers in transacting curriculum.
3. To propose possible suggestion for strengthening higher secondary school educational programme.
4. To find out whether there exist any significant differences in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on;
5. Gender
6. Experience
7. Status
8. Educational qualifications
9. Type of management
10. Subject specification

**Hypotheses of the study**

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on
2. Gender
3. Experience
4. Status
5. Educational qualification
6. Type of management
7. Subject specification
8. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on
9. Gender
10. Experience
11. Status
12. Educational qualification
13. Type of management
14. Subject specification
15. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on
16. Gender
17. Experience
18. Status
19. Educational qualification
20. Type of management
21. Subject specification
22. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of student’s academic excellence of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on
23. Gender
24. Experience
25. Status
26. Educational qualification
27. Type of management
28. Subject specification
29. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on
30. Gender
31. Experience
32. Status
33. Educational qualification
34. Type of management
35. Subject specification

**Methodology**

**Sample Selected for the Present Study**

The present study was conducted on a representative sample of 250 higher secondary school teachers of Calicut and Malappuram districts. The sampling technique used was stratified sampling method giving due representation to factors like gender, experience, status, educational qualification, type of management and subject specification.

**Tool Employed for the Collection of Data**

For to measure the opinion of higher secondary school teachers, investigator prepared an ‘opinionnaire ‘with the help of supervising teacher.

**Statistical Techniques Used For Analysing the Data**:

The following are the tools used for the study,

Percentage analysis

t-Test (Test of significance of mean difference)

ANOVA

**Scope and Limitation of the Study**

The study has been intended for studying ‘opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba committee report’. The study was conducted on a stratified sample of 250 higher secondary school teachers from Calicut and Malappuram districts. Due representation was given to factors like gender, experience, status, educational qualification, type of management, and subject specification.

The study tries to find out whether there exists considerable difference in the major difficulties felt by male and female teachers, Government, Aided and Unaided teachers, adequately qualified and over qualified teachers, teachers with ten year experience and above ten year experience.

The study was based on infrastructural facility, curriculum, teacher’s professional development, student’s academic excellence and evaluation system and it also list out the problem faced by higher secondary school teachers in transacting the curriculum and provide possible suggestions for strengthening the higher secondary school educational programme.

Even though precautions were taken to make the study as accurate as possible. There are certain limitations also. Some of them are,

1. The sample selected for the study confined to only two districts viz, Calicut and Malappuram.
2. The study is limited only to higher secondary school teachers due to practical problem.
3. All the higher secondary schools of Calicut and Malappuram were not included in the study, only representative sample was taken from Government, Aided and Unaided institutions due to time frame of the study.
4. The sample study was limited to 250 higher secondary school teachers.
5. The investigator used only one tool for data collection. So the scope of cross checking for validity was limited.

**Organisation of the report**

The report of the study is presented. The study is presented in five chapters. The details incorporated in each chapter as follows.

**Chapter I** Presents a brief introduction of the study, statement of the problem, definition of key terms, variable of the study, objectives of the study, hypothesis, methodology, scope and limitations of the study and organisation of the report.

**Chapter II** Presents the review of related literature which includes theoretical over view and review of related studies.

**Chapter III** Presents the methodology of the study, details of variables, tool used, selection of sample procedure for data collection, scoring techniques used for analysis and statistical technique used.

**Chapter IV** Brings out the details of statistical analysis of the data and discussion of the result.

**Chapter V** Deals with summary of the study, major findings, educational implications of the study and suggestions for further research in this area.

Chapter II

**REVIEW OF RELATED**

**LITERATURE**

* **Theoretical Overview**
* **Review of related studies**

**Review of Related Literature**

A literature review in a qualitative study may be viewed as a preliminary or flexible conceptual frame work, or a joining of ideas often from different disciplines. Good qualitative reviews of literature convince the reader that a phenomenon is important and that it is not understood sufficiently well. Review of related literature is a concise, condensed summary of existing knowledge and idea related to the research problem and synopsis of key research studies already published. This important component provides a solid frame work for the research work (Suter, 2006).

Every piece of ongoing research needs to be connected with the work already done, to attain an overall relevance and purpose. The review of literature thus becomes a link between the research proposed and the studies already done. It tells the reader about aspects that have been already established or concluded by other authors, and also gives the chance to the reader to appreciate the evidence that has already been collected by previous researches and thus project the current work in the proper perspective.

In this chapter the research attempts to take the advantage of the knowledge accumulated in the past as a result of various works conducted by a number of pupils. This chapter contains the review of related studies such as research journals, books, theses, dissertations and other sources of information on the problem to be selected which is one of the important steps in planning the research study.

The literature surveyed by the investigator has been classifies under two heads. They are,

1. Theoretical Overview
2. Review of Related Literature

**Theoretical Overview**

The major focus in this part of research report is to draw out the theoretical basis of implementation of Labba Committee Report on higher secondary education. In this part the investigator tries to include the major curricular innovations that are taken place in Kerala higher secondary education system.

**Kerala school curriculum –higher secondary level**

The impact of the social and cultural renaissance and concept of free and universal education paved the way for enforcing the reputation of Kerala as a knowledge society. We have been successful in ensuring quality education through constructive curriculum revisions. Such interventions have made the education sector in Kerala internationally significant.

We have been successful in bringing children from all sections of society to school in early decades of the twentieth century itself. Efforts were made at all levels to provide free as well as universal education. Various factors like the intervention of Government, the work of missionaries and social reformation movements, contributed to the progress and development of general education. Many National study report as well as approaches, from University Education Commission under the chairmanship of Dr. Radhakrishnan (constituted soon after the independence), to NCF 2005, have influenced the social curriculum revision of our state.

The Secondary Education Commission headed by Dr. Lakshmana swami Muthaliar explicated the importance of secondary education. The Three language formula (Regional language+ Hindi+ English) was introduced by this commission. ‘Education and National Development’, the report submitted by Dr.D.S.Kothari brought under study, various stages of education from primary level to higher education level. The 10+2+3 pattern was first proposed by the commission. The National Policy on Education 1986 approved this pattern. It was on the basis of this pattern that higher secondary education came in to existence in Kerala.1990’s show a shift from the teacher centred curriculum to learner centred as well as activity based curriculum.

The NCF 2005 sowed the seed for many reforms in the field of education in India subsequently, NCERT prepared textbook for various subjects based on NCF 2005. The Right to Education Act 2009 evolved to universalise elementary education. Later, KCF 2007 was formed and the curriculum up to high school level was revised. Prof.P.O.J Labba committee report related to higher secondary education and Dr. P.K.Abdul Aziz committee report related to the comprehensive curriculum revision- all pointed towards the necessity of curriculum reforms.

The beginning of higher secondary sector was distinctive stage in the history of education in Kerala. Higher secondary education became widespread and popular with de-linking of pre-degree course from the Department of Higher education and making it a part of General Education Department. The Directorate Higher Secondary Education was formed in 1990 in Kerala and the higher secondary course was started by upgrading 31 Government high schools. Initially, text book as per the pre-degree syllabus of Calicut University and some of the NCERT textbook were used for higher secondary education.

In the 1990’s, a new curriculum with comprehensive change in learning and pedagogy was introduced at the primary level. Based on this activity- based, process-oriented and learner-centred curriculum, continuous and comprehensive evaluation (CCE) and grading system were implemented. Subsequently, this method was introduced at the higher secondary level too. However, a comprehensive revision of curriculum had not been implemented at the higher secondary level, through text book for certain subjects, source books and Edumates for all subjects were prepared by SCERT. To ensure quality education at the higher secondary level, the Government continues to implement several comprehensive teacher transformation programmes. Subject- based teacher clusters help to discuss the problem experienced in the teaching learning process and to plan learning activities.

**Significant of Curriculum Revision**

Changes occur every minute in the field of knowledge. Only by absorbing and imbibing these changes can a curriculum with contemporary relevance move ahead. We have been trying to do this and it is this change that makes the curriculum in Kerala different from that of other Indian state.

Through activity based pedagogy as already been introduced at the higher secondary level, a comprehensive revision of curriculum has not been implemented yet. The ongoing syllabus revision interacts with contemporary events and takes in to consideration the nature of the learner. As a stepping stone to higher secondary curriculum should be raised to International standard. International standards do not refer to the standard of education set by any particular country. On the other hand, it must inculcate the learner the ability to take his life forward wherever he is, after the completion of his higher secondary education. It is the sum-total of all experiences and knowledge to be picked up by the learner for meeting the needs. This emphasises the need to provide internationally accepted teaching- learning models to our students. The curriculum revision has been envisaged as an attempt in this direction. The expert committee constituted by the Government for curriculum revision stressed the necessity for timely, appropriate revisions. Besides, curriculum revision must also incorporate the postulate related to curriculum and assessment in the Right to Education Act.

**Curriculum Approach**

Our curriculum has been developed, imbibing new thoughts in educational psychology and philosophy. The idea of constructivism put forth by NCF 2005 is the basis for the Kerala School Curriculum 2013 too. In constructivism, learning is the process of the construction of knowledge.

Every child is born with the natural ability to learn from the surroundings using his/her sense organs. The formal education in school imparts to the learner the possibility to view and understand the world from a fresh perspective and to mingle and assess it. So the striking features of the curriculum transactions approach are,

1. Activity-based
2. Process-related
3. Ensure learning
4. Focus to attain learning outcome
5. Environment- friendly
6. Highlights development area
7. Suitable for the nature of learner
8. Integrates learning and assessment

A learning process based on constructivism is the foundation of the curriculum. A distinguishing feature of this approach is that knowledge is constructed naturally by creating challenging learning activities and considering the acquired knowledge and conceptual back ground of the learner. The Student-centred instruction focuses on skills and practices that enable life long and independent problem-solving. Here the learning theory and practice are based on the constructivist learning theory that emphasizes the learner's critical role in constructing meaning from new information and prior experience. The learner centred education mainly focuses on the following areas;

1. **Learning Experience**

The acquired knowledge, skill and interest differ from learners coming from different backgrounds. So it is very important to facilitate learning experiences imbibing these changes and considering individual differences and multiple intelligence of the learner.

1. **Learning Environment**

The class room should be designed to keeping in mind the interest and development of the learner so as to ensure his/her participation in various learning activities. Every activity should be learner oriented. A conducive environment should be created. The freedom to employ suitable learning strategies which are learner centred and activity based, taking in to consideration the development and growth in the learning ambience rests with the teacher.

1. **Learning Process**
2. Each learner construct knowledge by linking it with his or her previous experience
3. Knowledge construction occurs at the level of the individual through meaningful societal interventions
4. Learning is made effective through multy- sensory experiences which consider various learning styles, learning pace etc.
5. Learning becomes mere effective through co-operative learning in an environment conducive for co-operation
6. Learning material should be meaningful generating interest in the learner
7. Spiralling of learning experiences will make learning more effective
8. By ensuring flexibility of learning activities and possibilities of adaptation, learners require special educational needs and different aptitudes
9. Each learner should get learning experience necessary to ensure learning outcomes
10. Learning and assessment should be complimentary
11. Everybody can attain learning outcomes by adopting suitable teaching learning strategies that consider content and learning requirements of the learner
12. **Learning Outcomes**

As per the rules of the RTE act, the idea of learning outcome was introduced in the Kerala School Curriculum 2013. Knowledge of learning outcome is essential to plan the teaching learning process and evaluation, in a precise and particular manner. The learning outcome should be stated based on performance that can be observed and measured. The statement of learning outcome should be simple, lucid, precise and logical. They should be presented without causing any confusion to teachers, students and parents.

**Policy Directions in Higher Secondary Education**

***National Curriculum Framework (NCF- 2005)***

On the basis of Programme of Action and National Policy on Education NCF 2005 was introduced by Government of India. The main objectives is to remove gender, caste, religious barrier. Seeking guidance from the constitutional vision of India as a secular, egalitarian and pluralistic society, founded on the values of social justice and equality, certain broad aims of education have been identified in this document NCF 2005. These include independence of thought and action, sensitivity to others, well-being and feelings, learning to respond to new situations in a flexible and creative manner, predisposition towards participation in democratic process, and the ability to work towards and contribute to economic processes, and social change.

NCF proposes five guiding principles for curriculum development.

1. Connecting knowledge to life outside the school
2. Ensuring that learning shifts away from rote methods
3. Enriching the curriculum so that it goes beyond text books
4. Making examination more flexible and integrating them with class room life
5. Nurturing and over-riding identity informed by caring concerns within the democratic policy of the country.

The NCF 2005 was framed keeping the above mentioned guiding principles as to implement many good ideas that have already been articulated in the past. The documents seek to provide a framework within which teachers and schools can choose and plan experiences that they think children should have. In order to realise educational objectives, the curriculum should be conceptualised as a structure that articulate required experiences.

***Kerala curriculum framework (KCF- 2007)***

The curriculum revision programme in Kerala is launched as part of an endeavour to strengthen the primary, secondary and higher secondary school education in Kerala. We have already won laurels in matters like rate of literacy and enrolment of students in school. In order to advance further in this direction, we should ensure quality education to all children without any form of discrimination. Such an endeavour should also serve the needs of the future society.

The curriculum revision programme in Kerala was conceptualised on the basis of the recommendations of the NCF 2005. The curriculum revision initiated in 1996 in Kerala had a strong influence in the formation of National Curriculum Framework. Kerala could display the active working model of a learning process that has its foundation in the principles of constructivism and a learner- centred, activity- based, and process- oriented pedagogy. Therefore, we must now envision educational reforms that go beyond the National Curriculum Framework, making it a springboard for further research.

The main aims of KCF 2007 are preparing learning materials, ensure the quality of education, create conducive educational environment, active participation of the civil society. Which would make the curricular frame work more popular and acceptable?

***Labba Committee Report***

To study the problems faced by higher secondary schools, Government of Kerala appointed a committee GO (Rt) No.4933/2012/G Edn dated 12.10.2012. Professor P.O.J. Labba, former principal of TKM Engineering College, Kollam was the Chairman of the committee. Professor George onamkoor former head of Malayalam Department, Mar Eronios College, Thiruvanandapuram and Sri. K.J. Sukumarapillai, retired additional Secretary, Finance Department Government Secretariat Thiruvanandapuram were the members of the Committee. Professor K.A. Hashim, Director of SCERT Thiruvanandhapuram was appointed as the convener.

On the basis of the committee there are certain recommendations that need to be implemented in the short term as well as long term. The curriculum and syllabus of higher secondary courses that have been in place for more than five year should be revised under the supervision of the SCERT. The text book should be prepared keeping in view the recent trends and developments, the report recommended adding that an expert committee should be constituted for revising the syllabus and curriculum. Public examination can be done away with for class XI. Instead, annual examination can be conducted in school with a common question paper prepared under the supervision of the SCERT. Teacher student ratio in higher secondary school should be 1:40. If there are more than 50 students, it should be treated as a new batch. The committee recommends five working days in a week for higher secondary courses and re scheduling of time tables. However, the system of six working days in a week should continue for vocational higher secondary courses. The report also recommends setting up an independent body on the lines of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) which would grade both private and Government higher secondary schools. Setting up of a specialised higher secondary academic wing to co-ordinate functioning of higher secondary education and vocational higher secondary education, has also been proposed in the report. Other recommendations include constitution of the quality improvement cell under SCERT.

With change in time table, the working hours of the school is changed from the existing schedule of 9.30am-4 pm to 9am-4.30 pm. It had been a long time since the teachers in higher secondary sector pointing out about arranging classes on Saturdays, while it remained holidays for classes 1-X and also colleges.

According to the revised time table, there will be a total of 47 periods in a week. There will be ten periods from Monday to Thursday while Friday will have only seven periods. Two periods in a week is being allocated for physical education. If the first period from Monday to Thursday is scheduled to have duration of 45 minutes, Friday will have timing from 9.15am to 9.55am. On Friday the lunch break has been extended making 90 minutes while it is stipulated to 35 minutes on other days.

**Higher secondary time table**

The weakly period structure of higher secondary school time table before and after revision is shows in the table 1.

Table 1

***Weekly period structure***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Days | Before Revision | After Revision |
| Monday | 8 | 10 |
| Tuesday | 8 | 10 |
| Wednesday | 8 | 10 |
| Thursday | 8 | 10 |
| Friday | 7 | 7 |
| Saturday | 8 | No class |
| Total | 47 | 47 |

The subject wise period structure of higher secondary school time table before and after revision is shows in the table 2.

Table 2

*Subject wise period structure*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | Old | New |
| Core subjects | 4\*8 = 32 | 4\*8 = 32 |
| English | 1\*7 =7 | 1\*7 =7 |
| Second language | 1\*6 =6 | 1\*6 =6 |
| Physical education | 1\*2 = 2 | 1\*2 = 2 |
| Total | 47 | 47 |

The day wise period structure of higher secondary school time table before and after revision is shows in the table 3.

Table 3

*Day wise period structure*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period Number | Before Revision | | After Revision | |
|  | Time | Duration (minutes) | Time | Duration (minutes) |
| 1 | 09.30-10.15 | 45 | 09.00-09.45 | 45 |
| 2 | 10.15-11.00 | 45 | 09.45-10.25 | 40 |
| 3 | 11.05-11.50 | 45 | 10.25-11.05 | 40 |
| 4 | 11.50-12.30 | 40 | 11.05-11.50 | 40 |
| 5 | 01.30-02.10 | 40 | 11.50-12.30 | 40 |
| 6 | 02.10-02.50 | 40 | 01.05-01.55 | 50 |
| 7 | 02.55-3.30 | 35 | 01.55-02.35 | 40 |
| 8 | 03.30-04.15 | 45 | 02.35-03.15 | 40 |
| 9 |  |  | 03.20-03.55 | 35 |
| 10 |  |  | 03.55-04.30 | 35 |
| Total |  | 335 minutes |  | 395 minutes |

The period structure on Friday of higher secondary school time table before and after revision is shows in the table 4.

Table 4

*Period structure on Friday*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period number | Before Revision | | After Revision | |
|  | Time | Duration | Time | Duration |
| 1 | 09.30-10.15 | 45 | 09.00-09.55 | 55 |
| 2 | 10.15-11.00 | 45 | 09.55-10.40 | 50 |
| 3 | 11.05-11.50 | 45 | 10.50-11.40 | 50 |
| 4 | 11.50-12.30 | 40 | 11.40-12.30 | 50 |
| 5 | 02.10-02.50 | 40 | 2.10-02.50 | 50 |
| 6 | 02.55-3.30 | 35 | 02.50-03.40 | 50 |
| 7 | 03.30-04.15 | 45 | 03.45-04.30 | 45 |
| Total |  | 295 minutes |  | 350minutes |

As Saturday‘s remains holiday for the higher secondary, teachers and students would get enough time to prepare their lessons and be prepared for their academic activities. The committee also give proposal to reduce the work load of the principal. Other recommendations are briefly described below;

***Career guidance and counselling programmes for parents and students***

It is the duty of SCERT to form a counselling pool for more than one school based on the qualification of counsellors. It is very necessary to provide guidance and counselling to both parents and students for selecting career in future.

***Special increment for highly qualified teachers***

Double promotion can be provided to those teachers who have Ph.D degree. This helps to promote continuing education and highly qualified teachers in the field of higher secondary school level.

***Appointment of Peon and Clerk***

For the smooth functioning of the higher secondary school programmes there must be a peon and clerk. It helps to reduce the work load of principal and other teachers from various activities. But unfortunately that post does not exist in higher secondary level. The committee also recommended for the appointment of peon and clerk.

***Teacher’s promotion***

Labba committee recommended that those junior teachers who completed their five year of experience in higher secondary level must be promoted as senior teachers.

***Training related to Information Technology***

New education system mainly focuses on smart classroom. This helps to improve the efficiency of students in learning. The era of information technology demands that every teacher must be aware of information technology. So some crash courses and training must be provided to higher secondary school teachers.

**Dimensions of Labba Committee Report**

On analysing the Labba committee report, the investigator with the help of supervising teacher made five dimensions for which the opinion of higher secondary school teachers want to be addressed. Thus five dimensions are considered to be covering all the major areas of the report are described below.

***Academic excellence***

It is the outcome of education, the extent to which a student, teacher or institution has achieved their educational goal. When students feel safe, engaged and respected they can focus in their academic goal. Effective character ensure that these needs are met character education is the foundation upon which students can reach academic excellence. It is not just about teaching students to be good, teaching them to their best.

As per the recommendation of Labba committee, it gives emphasis to the academic excellence of the students through various ways. In higher secondary school academic excellence can be improved when the teachers got adequate training about new curriculum. Effective transaction of curriculum helps the teacher to improve the academic excellence among students. The committee also change the teacher student proportion in to 1:40. It also helps the teacher to give individual attention to each student than before. By adding values in curriculum can also improve the academic excellence of students.

***Curriculum***

In education curriculum is the totality of student’s experience that occur in the educational process. According to Cunningham ‘curriculum is a tool in the hands of an artist (teacher) to mould his material (pupil) according to his/her ideas (aims and objectives) in his/her studio (school)’. Curriculum is an important element of education. Aims of education are reflected in the curriculum. The aims of education are attained by the school programmes concerning knowledge, experience, activities, skill and values. The different school programmes are jointly known as curriculum. As per Labba Committee Report there were various changes take place in curriculum. Number of electives increased is one of the important recommendations included in the report. The students can choose any interested electives as their study. It will help them to improve their performance. Various values and awareness programmes are included in the curriculum. It will also helps the students to get awareness about road safety, antidrug usage etc. Various co-curricular activities are also recommended by the committee.

***Professional development***

Professional development refers to the development of a person in his or her professional role. Professional development related recommendations are included in Labba Committee Report. Special increment for high qualified teachers, appointment of peon and clerk, change in the structure of SET examination, training programmes to teachers about information technology, reduced the work load of higher secondary principal etc are some of them.

***Evaluation system***

Evaluation refers to a broad range of activities and task including observation, worksheet, essay, presentation, group work, performance and more traditional forms of testing. The main reason teachers evaluate is to find out what students have learned, the outcome of the instruction. Teachers gather information about students.

***Infrastructural facilities***

Infrastructure means the facilities provided to the students to make improvements in their educational process. Infrastructure includes computer labs, digital class room, class room materials, library, school building, physical education room etc.

**Review of related literature**

Review of related literature is an important aspect of any research. Every research project then completed becomes the part of accumulated knowledge in the field and so it contributes to thinking and research that follows. For any specific project to occupy this place in the development of discipline the researcher must be thoroughly familiar with both previous theory and research. To assure this familiarity every research project whether in the social or physical sciences, needs a review of theoretical and research literature project.

In the field of education, the research worker needs to acquire up to date information about what has been through and done in the particular area from which a problem of research was taken. The review of related literature helps the investigator to clarify and define the problem in the context of research work already done in the chosen field. It is an indispensable step for a research as it gives a deep insight and understanding of the problem. By examining what has already been done in that area. The investigator becomes familiar with various trends and phases in the area. According to Turney and Rubb, the identification of a problem development of a research design and determination of the size and scope of the problem, all depends to a great extent on the care and intensity with which research has examined the literature related to the intended researcher.

Jahfar mangattuchali (2013) conducted a survey among 556 higher secondary school students on ‘Three fold model of intellectual style among Higher secondary school students’. The main objective of the study was to find out different levels of intellectual style among higher secondary school students and to find out whether there exist any significant difference in Type -1 and Type 2 and Type 3 intellectual style among higher secondary school students based on subsample gender, locality, subject, type of management. The major findings of the study was there exist significance difference in the mean score intellectual style among higher secondary school students based on gender and type of management for type 1 and type 2 and type 3 intellectual style respectively. There is no significance difference in the mean score of intellectual style higher secondary school students based on subject study and locale of the school.

Ashraf. M (2013) conducted a survey among 200 teachers educators taken from 76 colleges including university education centre of university of Calicut on ‘Opinion of Teachers Educators Towards Newly revised B.Ed curriculum of Calicut university’. The main objectives of the study are to analyse the opinion of teacher educators towards newly revised B.Ed curriculum based on structure of course, core and optional course practical’s, process and examinations, to list out the problem faced by the teacher educators in transacting curriculum and to propose possible suggestions for strengthening the B.Ed programme based on new curriculum. The major findings of the study were the entire general teacher educators opined that it was absolute necessary to revise Bed curriculum, where as four percentages optional teachers disagree with this statement. While majority of the general teacher educators opinioned that subject council should be formed out in service courses should be provided to teacher educators. Seventy two percentage optional teacher educators also agree to this point. The data reveals that majority of the teacher educators have the opinion that all the papers in B.Ed curriculum is relevant and activity oriented. It also point that many papers are helpful to comprehend the continuous change in the educational sector and the paper technology and informatics in education enable the student teacher to make use of new technology. Though most of teacher educators support the process which include is revised B.Ed curriculum. Being a time bounded programme, there is not enough time to do process effectively. Most of the sample opinioned that active participation in field trip enables the trainee to organize study tour in school but it becomes more excursion programme now. Majority of teacher educators agree the thought B.Ed in a programme for matured student, the community living camp should be compulsory component in B.Ed curriculum. Most of the teacher educators opined that the pattern of examinations sufficient to evaluate student teacher, but it should be more application oriented.

Saifunnisa. K (2013) conducted a study on opinion of college teachers on Hrudayakumari committee report; the study is proposed to conduct on a sample of 326 college teachers working in arts and science colleges. Tool used for the study is opinionnaire for college teachers on Hrudayakumari committee report. The main objective of the study is to find out the opinion of college teachers on Hridayakumari committee report and to find out the opinion of college teachers on hridayakumari committee report based on subsamples like gender, experience and type of management. The major findings of the study shows that majority of college teachers from arts and Science College agree with hridayakumari committee report from this female and arts teachers more agree with this report.

Geethu mol (2012) conducted a study among 150 teachers educators working in B.Ed colleges and 250 M.Ed students under the University of Calicut. On ‘Reaction of teacher educators and M.Ed students towards the existing practical’s in B.Ed curriculum.’ The main objectives of this study were to analyse the reaction of teacher educators and Med students regarding the existing the practical’s in B.Ed curriculum, to list out the problem faced by the teacher educators with implementation of practical in Bed curriculum and to give suggestions for strengthening the existing practical’s in B.Ed curriculum. The major findings of the study were majority of the teacher educators and M.Ed students were says majority of B.Ed practical’s will helps improve the teaching competency of the student teacher. But most of the practicals should be reframed. The achievement test based on the environmental sustainability post test and retention test. And self instructional module on environmental sustainability at 8th level.

Jayadevan (2011) conducted a study among 600 secondary students from Malappuram district on “School environment at secondary level in Malappuram district”. The main objective of the study was to find out the extend of the school environment (total and component wise) at secondary level in the total sample and the relevant sub sample based on gender of the student, locale of the school, type of management of the school and efficiency of the school. The major findings of the study was there exists significant difference in the mean score of school environment between male and female secondary school students (CR= 4.6, p< 0.01). There exists significant difference in the mean score of school environment between urban and rural secondary school students (CR = 1.99, p < 0.05 ). The main effect of type of management of the school on school environment is significant ( F= 8.60, p > 0.01 for 2.577 degree of freedom), there is no significant difference in the mean score of school environment between high and low efficient secondary school students ( CR= 1.09, p > 0.05)

Shabeeba (2011) conducted a study among 300 higher secondary school teachers, in Kozhikode, Malappuram, Palakkad and Wayanad districts on “ Academic motivation of higher secondary school teachers”. The main objective of the study were to find out the extend of academic motivation of higher secondary school teachers in the total sample and in the relevant sub sample based on gender, type of management, locale of institution, subject of teaching, qualification and teaching experience, to find out whether there exist significant difference in the mean score academic motivation of higher secondary school teachers among the relevant sub sample based on gender, locale of institution, qualification and teaching experience, to find out whether type of management, gender and subject of teaching have main and interaction effect on academic motivation on higher secondary teachers. The main hypotheses of the study were most of the sub samples were differed in their extend of academic motivation. In the case male and female higher secondary school teachers, male teachers show higher academic motivation rather than female teachers, there is difference in extend of academic motivation of higher secondary school teachers based on their type of management of institution. Aided higher secondary school teachers show higher academic motivation than unaided higher secondary school teachers, the least urban higher secondary school teachers show higher academic motivation than rural higher secondary school teachers, the higher secondary school teachers who handle arts and science subjects simultaneously show same rate of academic motivation. The commerce teachers show comparatively higher academic motivation, the high qualified higher secondary school teachers posses higher academic motivation than low qualified higher secondary school teachers. While considering the teaching experience, teachers having low experience show high academic motivation than those having high experience and significant mean difference was observed between the mean score of male and female, urban and rural and low and high teaching experienced higher secondary school teachers.

Anju Krishnan (2010) conducted a study about ‘opinion of college teachers on recommendation of Yesh pal committee on higher education. The major objectives of the study is to find out the opinion of college teachers on recommendation made by Yesh pal committee on higher education in teachers working in arts and science colleges, teacher education colleges and technical colleges. The investigator selected the sample of 250 college teachers from three districts Viz; Calicut, Malappuram and Palakkad. From the study reveals that most of the college teachers are good opinion about recommendation of Yesh pal committee report.

Fousiya (2009) conducted a study on ‘attitude of primary school teachers towards issue based curriculum in Kerala’. For this study 400 primary school teachers were included and the data were collected through a rating scale. The main objective of the study was to assess the attitude of primary school teachers towards issue based curriculum. The major findings revealed that the teachers have positive attitude towards issue based curriculum. But they opine that there are so many practical difficulties in implementing issue based curriculum. These difficulties are mainly due to lack of proper training for teachers and lack of adequate infrastructural facilities.

Babitha (2008) conducted a study on the ‘assessment of instructional and infrastructural facilities of IT@ school project in Kozhikode revenue district’. 252 teachers and 850 high school students were included in the study. The data were collected through questionnaire and check list. The main objective of the study was to assess the infrastructural facilities and to list out the major instructional problems faced by the project. The study revealed the poor condition on IT Lab and other facilities. Lack of computer teachers, lack of equipment in IT lab etc are the main causes for the failure of the project.

Sreenath (2007) conducted a study on “The difficulties faced by the higher secondary science teachers of Kerala implementing the grading system”. Two hundred and fifty science teachers were included in the study and the data were collected through questionnaire. The main difficulties faced by higher secondary school science teachers of Kerala in implementing the grading system related to curriculum and planning, infrastructural facilities, the teaching learning process, evaluation and society involvement. The major findings were there are defects in curriculum and planning, there are difficulties because of lack of infrastructural facilities and there are so many difficulties in the process of teaching and learning and in continuous and comprehensive evaluation due to over crowed class room.

Bhagianathan (2006) studied ‘Awareness among higher secondary school teachers on the use of mass media for curriculum transaction’. The major objectives of the study was to find out awareness among higher secondary school teachers on the use of mass media for curriculum transaction and the study recommended the importance of giving in-service training for teachers in regard to the use of mass media, need for giving training for the effective transaction by using audio visual aids. The study suggested that the need for improving educational facilities in schools.

Balquies (2005) conducted a study on ‘difficulties faced by secondary school teachers of biology in implementing the instructional strategies in Kerala’. The sample comprised of 207 secondary school teachers of biology from various schools of Palakkad, Malappuram and Kozhikode districts in kerala. The main objective of the study is to identify the major difficulties faced by secondary school teachers of biology in implementing the instructional strategies. The major suggestions are, need for more resourceful in- service training programmes, maintaining of correct teacher- pupil ratio and reducing the present class size, more effective supervision, more attractive and spacious class rooms, more periods per class for teaching biology in standard IX and X. More freedom to take decisions regarding teaching, more support from administrators.

Junuvin (2005) conducted a study on ‘The problems faced by the teachers in English curriculum transaction at secondary level’. Two hundred English teachers of Trissure and Malappuram districts were included in the study and the data were collected through a questionnaire. The main objective of the study was to identify the problems faced by the teachers in English curriculum transaction at the secondary level. In her finding the major problems faced by English teachers are insufficient time, in appropriate and adequate content, in sufficient teacher training, inadequacy of library, un availability of learning materials, well equipped audio- visual aids, communicative problems and un awareness in new evaluation system.

Jasa (2004) conducted a survey among 100 high school teachers in Kozhikode district on ‘ Difficulties faced by secondary school teachers in implementing the revised curricular strategy’ the main objective of the study was to identify the major difficulties faced by secondary school teachers in implementing the revised curricular strategy. The major findings are training programmes revised are not adequate and proper, lack of infrastructural facilities is a serious problem faced by secondary school teachers, the revised curricular strategy which demands continuous and comprehensive evaluation has increased the work load of teachers and proper school- community relation has to be maintained to make instruction more real life oriented.

Saleemudheen (2003) conducted a study of the in – service training needs of secondary school mathematics teachers of Malappuram districts. The major findings of the study were the secondary school mathematics teachers of Malappuram district are not satisfied with the present in- service training courses with respect to their quality of content, resource persons and follow- up work. The authorities of in- service courses should assess the actual needs of teachers prior to the implementation of any in- service training course and actions should be taken to meet the requirements of teachers.

Kavitha mol (2003) conducted ‘an investigation in to the problems and difficulties of secondary school teachers by themselves and from students for effective teaching of mathematics’. 200 secondary school mathematics teachers and 400 students were included in the study. And the data were collected through different questionnaires for teachers and students. The investigator found that the major problems felt by teachers themselves are insufficient time, non availability of situation to provide enough learning experiences, lack of infrastructural facilities to implement appropriate methods of teaching, in appropriate pre service and in- service training. The major problem areas felt by teachers and students are lack of self- learning, improper learning strategy, lack of involvement of the students in learning, lack of interest towards learning, lack of motivation and variations in learning ability etc.

Rani (2000) conducted a study on ‘Difficulties faced by teachers in providing ideal environment for learning science in secondary school of Kerala’. The objectives of the study were to identify the difficulties faced by science teachers and to identify the order of components of ideal environment being difficult for teachers. The study revealed that the teachers felt difficulty due to in sufficient time, inadequate facilities, excess number of pupil, in sufficient financial support etc with regard to any component of ideal environment, these were the some difficulties identified.

Ramadevi (1998) conducted a study on the 'difficulties of teachers in teaching mathematics in upper primary schools in Kerala'. Major findings of the study were majority of the teachers have difficulty in the content area. Sixty two percentages of the teachers have difficulty in using aids for teaching different topics, 57% of the teachers need in service training, majority of teachers has difficulty in giving and correcting home work, environment, these were the same difficulties identified.

Sunderarajan (1994) conducted a study on “problem implementing effective role performance of higher secondary teachers”. Major findings of the study were the need for improving the instructional facilities, the administrative problem come next to the problem of facilities and the study also reveals that the need to equip the teachers with improved methodology so that they may play their role effectively.

Arulsami (1981) conducted a study on the topic ‘An investigation in to certain problems and needs of secondary schools teachers in Thirunalveli district’. The objectives of the study were identifying the problems of teachers with regard to the provision and facilities available to the teachers for professional growth. It was found that 87% women teachers have not attended any in service or refresher courses. The teachers have no idea about the new methods of teaching. They opined that if they get more opportunity to attend such training programmes it will raise their morals.

Arunajatal (1979) tried to identify the factors contributing to the efficiency of secondary schools. The sample consisted of 100 schools in Tamilnad. The findings were most of the schools have inadequate physical facilities like building furniture and class rooms, the schools have shortage of sports equipment and sufficient space for play ground.

Billing (1979) through the paper ‘Some educational problems to the modern teachers’ discussed that the problems of teachers in primary and upper primary class are entirely different from that of secondary teachers. The first and foremost duty of the teachers is to calm conquer the untamed crowd of students. The teaching- learning process basically requires either a blind faith in the teacher or some special fear of his personality as the fear or awe breeds respect and the respect enhances pace of this forward movement. To control the students is an uphill task.

Nelson (1975) conducted a study on the impact of in service programmes on teachers of science and mathematics in relation to new syllabus. The study was meant to find out the extent of effectiveness of the in service training programme for teachers of science and mathematics and to analyse the opinion of teachers regarding in service training. The major findings of the study were; majority of the teachers experience difficulty in handling classes properly due to the overloaded curriculum and also due to the lack of necessary resources and training, heads of the secondary schools in the state were of the opinion that adequate in service training were required for teachers and according to them the teachers who had given such training have shown much improvement in teaching science and mathematics.

The investigator did a careful review of the previous studies related to the present study with a view to get insight into the theoretical background to gather ideas. The knowledge secured through the related literature helped the investigator to define the exact problem, develop tool, select the method and also in the correct interpretation of findings. And also reviews have given scientific support to the investigator’s attempt to do the present study and since there is a real dearth of evidence from the studies and from the present geographical area, the study is highly relevant.

Chapter III

**METHODOLOGY**

* **Variables of the study**
* **Objectives of the study**
* **Hypothesis of the study**
* **Tool used for data collection**
* **Samples used for the study**
* **Data collection procedure, scoring and consolidation of data**
* **Statistical techniques used for Analysis**

**Methodology**

The procedure or technique employed in a research study is known as methodology of research. The adopted methods and tools determine the validity of the study and accuracy of the result. The methodology of the chapter points to the generalisability of the result by the collection and the analysis of the relevant data.

The study that the investigator conducted was intended to find out the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba committee report. The study was based on the subsamples gender, experience, status, educational qualification, type of management and subject specification. The design of the study describes the following major sections.

1. Variable
2. Objectives
3. Hypothesis
4. Sample used for the study
5. Tool used for the study
6. Data collection procedure, scoring and consolidation of data
7. Statistical technique used for the study.

The details of each of the above are given below:

**Variables**

The major objective of the study is to find out the Opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report.

**Objectives**

1. To analyse the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba committee report based on infrastructural facility, curriculum, teacher’s professional development, students academic excellence and evaluation system.

2. To list the problems faced by higher secondary school teachers in transacting curriculum.

3. To propose possible suggestions for strengthening higher secondary school educational programme.

4. To find out whether there exist any significant differences in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on;

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

**Hypothesis**

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

2. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

3. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

4. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of students academic excellence of Labba committee report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

**Method adopted for the study**

Since the aim of investigation was to find out the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba committee report, the investigator selected survey method, which the investigator thought is the most suitable method for the study.

Survey is one of the most commonly used methods of descriptive research in behavioural sciences. A survey constitutes a way of obtaining exact facts and figures about a current situation. It is a method of collecting and analysing data obtained from a large number of respondents responding a specific population through highly structured questionnaire, test or interview. It can be used for studying local as well as state, National and International aspects of education.

**Tool employed for the collection of data**

To carry out a research the researcher must gather data which to test the hypothesis or answer the question. So the data collection is a major part of the research process. For an effective data collection, an effective tool or technique has to be selected and necessary steps in the preparation of the tool or condition of technique were to be adopted. The tool or technique may vary as per the complexity, design, administration and interpretation of the research. The investigator used the following tool for the study.

* Opinionnaire on Labba Committee Report (Anees & Sruthi 2015)

**Description of the tool**

**Opinionnaire**

For the present study the investigator prepared and used an opinionnaire for collection of data. The opinionnaire was developed by the investigator under the guidance of supervising teacher and by seeking information from higher secondary teachers of various schools. The opinionnaire was entitled as OPINION OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS TOWARDS LABBA COMMITTEE REPORT. The various steps followed for the construction of opinionnaire were given below.

**Planning the tool**

The purpose of planning was to collect valuable information necessary for the preparation of the opinionnaire. The investigator first of all collected all relevant information about Labba Committee Report. The components of the tool were curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facility, professional development and evaluation system. The investigator planned to prepare an opinionnaire in which the teachers were to respond for each statement in three different ways - Agree, Uncertain and Disagree. The investigator discussed with the supervising teacher and higher secondary teachers. On the basis of which some were omitted and some got refined. The opinionnaire consisting 50 items were prepared. After standardisation of the tool seven items were avoided and final one is made with 43 statements. The details regarding the problem areas and distribution of statement under these problem areas are presented in table 5.

Table 5

*Distribution of items in each dimension*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sl.**  **No.** | **Dimensions of Labba Committee Report** | **Positive item** | **Negative item** |
| **1** | Curriculum | 2,4,8,9,15,19,25,30,39,44,45 | 1,21,22 |
| **2** | Academic excellence | 3,12,28,31,34,37,38 | 6,10,27 |
| **3** | Infrastructural facility | 18,40,42 | 14 |
| **4** | Professional development | 13,17,20,33,46,48,50 | 11,47,49 |
| **5** | Evaluation system | 32,35,41 | 7,26 |

**Components of Labba Committee Report**

The components of Labba committee report were categorized in to 5 major components.

***Curriculum***

Curriculum constitutes the means through which the ends of education are achieved. It refers to the totality of activities and experiences planned by school with a view to achieve the objectives of education.

***Academic excellence***

Academic excellence is the outcome of education, the extent to which students, teachers or institution has achieved their educational goal. It is commonly measured by examination or continuous assessment.

***Infrastructural facility***

It is the fundamental facility and system serving a school. It includes library, sports room, buildings and all other facilities of the school.

***Professional development***

Professional development encompasses all type of facilitated learning opportunities including credentials such as academic degree to formal course work, conference and formal learning opportunities situated in practice.

***Evaluation system***

Teacher gathers information about student’s achievement both formally and informally. Observation, group work, performance and examination are the important techniques used for evaluation.

**Finalization of the tool**

For the finalization of the opinionnaire item analysis was done. The draft form of the tool was administered on a sample of 250 higher secondary school teachers in Malappuram and Calicut district. The scored response sheet was arranged in the ascending order, on the basis of score obtained. The highest and lowest 27 % were taken as upper and lower group respectively.

**Samples used for the study**

Due to the limitation of conducting the study on the total population, the investigator confined the study to the sample representing the population.

The population for the present study covers the higher secondary school teachers of Calicut and Malappuram districts. The following points were considered for the selection of the sample for the study.

1. Gender Viz; Male and Female
2. Locale Viz; Urban and Rural
3. Status Viz; Junior and Senior
4. Type of management Viz; Government, Aided and Unaided
5. Subject specification viz; Science, Commerce and Humanities

Stratified random sampling was used on the basis of gender, locality, status, type of management and subject specification. The study was conducted on 250 higher secondary school teachers from 25 schools of Calicut and Malappuram districts. The sample selected is given in the table 6 below.

Table 6

*Details of the final sample*

| Sl.  No. | Name of the schools | Type of management | Sample size |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | MSNSSHSS Chakkalakuth, Nilambur | Aided | 10 |
| 2 | GBHSS Manjeri | Govt | 10 |
| 3 | Islahiya HSS Malappuram | Unaided | 10 |
| 4 | CHMHSS Pookolathoor | Aided | 10 |
| 5 | MAHSS Pookiparamba | Aided | 10 |
| 6 | IKTHSS Cherukulamba | Aided | 10 |
| 7 | SSHSS Moorkkanad | Aided | 10 |
| 8 | CHMKMHSS Iruvetti | Aided | 10 |
| 9 | PTMHSS Thazhekkode | Aided | 10 |
| 10 | GHSS Pang | Govt | 10 |
| 11 | GHSS Kavanoor | Govt | 10 |
| 12 | GHSS Areacode | Govt | 10 |
| 13 | GVHSS Pullanoor | Govt | 10 |
| 14 | PTMHSS Vellila | Aided | 10 |
| 15 | MOAHSS Elayoor | Unaided | 10 |
| 16 | SPB HSS Rananattukara | Aided | 10 |
| 17 | GHSS Bepur | Govt | 10 |
| 18 | Chimaya Vidyalaya Calicut | Unaided | 10 |
| 19 | MJHSS Elettil | Aided | 10 |
| 20 | HSS Kuttamboor | Aided | 10 |
| 21 | Nanmanda higher secondary school | Aided | 10 |
| 22 | PVSHSS Eranjikkal | Aided | 10 |
| 23 | GHSS kokkalloor | Govt | 10 |
| 24 | REC GHSS Chathamangalam | Govt | 10 |
| 25 | Dayapuram residential school | Unaided | 10 |

**Data Collection Procedure, Scoring and Consolidation of Data**

***Administration of the tool***

After selecting the sample, the investigator contacted the head of the institution and sought permission to administer the tool. The head of the institution, teaching and non teaching staff were so co-operative during the time of data collection. The tool was distributed among higher secondary school teachers and was given enough time to fill the sheet after some general instruction by the investigator. The investigator clarified the doubt of teachers during the time of administration of tool.

***Scoring and Consolidation of Data***

Both positive and negative items were including in the opinionnaire. Each item includes statement and three alternative responses viz; agree, uncertain and disagree. For the positive item the score to the response agree, uncertain and disagree are 3, 2 and 1 respectively. For negative items scoring was done in the reverse order.

***Try-out of the preliminary tool***

Try out of the tool aims to select the item for the final scale by empirically testing the item characteristics. The procedure of the item analysis is discussed below.

For try-out the preliminary opinionnaire was administrated on a sample of 250 higher secondary school teachers selected by random sample technique. The 250 response sheets obtained were scored and the total score for each subject was calculated. After scoring, the sheets were arranged in the descending order of the total score. The highest and lowest 27% (135 sheets) of the scoring sheet were separated.

The mean and standard deviation score obtained for each item for the upper and lower group were calculated separately. The critical ratio was calculated for each item using the formula.

Where,

= Mean of the First group

= Mean of the Second group

= Standard deviation of First group

= Standard deviation of Second group

=Size of (the sample) First group

=Size of (the sample) Second group

Item with critical ratio greater than 1.44, the tabled value of‘t’ at 85%level scale were taken. Thus after standardisation final tool consists of 43 item. The critical ratio (t value) obtained for each item together with mean and standard deviation of the scores for the two groups are given Table 7.

Table 7

*Critical Ratio (t value) with Mean and Standard Deviation of the score of the two groups*

| Sl NO |  |  |  |  | ‘t’ value |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1.89 | 1.49 | .965 | .704 | 2.779 |
| 2 | 2.522 | 1.850 | .805 | .723 | 5.082 |
| 3 | 1.851 | 2.313 | .665 | .783 | 3.332 |
| 4 | 2.850 | 2.075 | .500 | .765 | 6.951 |
| 5 | 2.134 | 2.134 | .919 | .776 | .000 \* |
| 6 | 2.567 | 1.910 | .763 | .733 | 5.080 |
| 7 | 2.089 | 1.865 | .883 | .756 | 1.576\* |
| 8 | 2.865 | 2.119 | .457 | .788 | 6.702 |
| 9 | 2.910 | 2.283 | .378 | .813 | 5.722 |
| 10 | 1.597 | 1.895 | .853 | .800 | -2.088 |
| 11 | 2.403 | 1.746 | .817 | .724 | 4.919 |
| 12 | 2.910 | 2.00 | .416 | .718 | 8.979 |
| 13 | 3.00 | 2.447 | .000 | .723 | 6.246 |
| 14 | 1.641 | 1.865 | .932 | .736 | -1.542\* |
| 15 | 2.432 | 1.865 | .833 | .814 | 3.970 |
| 16 | 2.209 | 2.014 | .844 | .748 | 1.407\* |
| 17 | 2.940 | 2.313 | .342 | .722 | 6.419 |
| 18 | 2.910 | 2.119 | .336 | .769 | 7.713 |
| 19 | 2.731 | 1.850 | .617 | .802 | 7.118 |
| 20 | 2.910 | 2.462 | .416 | .822 | 3.975 |
| 21 | 2.776 | 2.074 | .572 | .765 | 6.009 |
| 22 | 2.686 | 2.000 | .656 | .717 | 5.779 |
| 23 | 1.865 | 1.895 | .935 | .699 | -.209\* |
| 24 | 1.970 | 1.835 | .984 | .863 | .840\* |
| 25 | 2.776 | 2.176 | .572 | .796 | 4.982 |
| 26 | 2.343 | 1.686 | .826 | .742 | 4.837 |
| 27 | 2.373 | 1.88 | .901 | .826 | 3.297 |
| 28 | 1.761 | 1.68 | .678 | .808 | 3.240 |
| 29 | 1.761 | 1.688 | .970 | .762 | .495\* |
| 30 | 2.626 | 2.000 | .670 | .778 | 4.994 |
| 31 | 2.806 | 1.955 | .499 | .883 | 8.222 |
| 32 | 2.806 | 2.119 | .499 | .769 | 6.127 |
| 33 | 2.656 | 2.253 | .664 | .822 | 3.120 |
| 34 | 2.895 | 2.268 | .394 | .729 | 6.184 |
| 35 | 2.88 | 2.074 | .370 | .658 | 8.732 |
| 36 | 2.00 | 1.791 | .969 | .807 | 1.356\* |
| 37 | 3.00 | 2.44 | .000 | .723 | 6.246 |
| 38 | 3.00 | 2.014 | .000 | .788 | 10.232 |
| 39 | 3.00 | 2.11 | .000 | .826 | 8.725 |
| 40 | 2.955 | 2.432 | .271 | .679 | 5.846 |
| 41 | 2.597 | 2.014 | .675 | .706 | 4.873 |
| 42 | 2.88 | 2.388 | .444 | .737 | 4.681 |
| 43 | 1.761 | 1.597 | .938 | .759 | 1.113\* |
| 44 | 2.970 | 2.044 | .244 | .786 | 9.193 |
| 45 | 1.686 | 1.970 | .801 | .758 | -2.102 |
| 46 | 2.731 | 2.447 | .566 | .702 | 2.573 |
| 47 | 2.253 | 1.701 | .893 | .733 | 3.899 |
| 48 | 2.776 | 2.343 | .623 | .708 | 3.755 |
| 49 | 1.850 | 1.567 | .957 | .743 | 1.915\* |
| 50 | 3.000 | 1.985 | .000 | .843 | 9.846 |

* Indicate rejected items

**Validity**

According to Best and Khan (2009) ‘validity is the quality of data gathering instrument or procedure that enable it to measure what it is supposed to measure’

Since the investigator prepared the opinionnaire by reading authentic books, discussing with higher secondary school teachers and discussion with experts, the investigator hoped that the tool covered all the dimensions of Labba Committee Report and which is potent to find out the opinion of higher secondary school teachers and hence it has validity with reference to content. The items in the present opinionnaire were phrased in the least ambiguous way and the meaning of the terms was clearly defined. It is found that experts comprehended the opinionnaire clearly and responded to the items without misunderstanding. It has face validity as it is examined and approved by experts.

**Reliability**

Reliability of a test refers to its consistency. According to Best and Khan (2009) ‘reliability is the degree of consistency that the instrument or procedure demonstrate. Whatever it is measuring, it does so consistently’. The term reliability has two closely related but somewhat different connotation in psychological testing. First it refers to the extent to which a test is internally consistent that is consistency of result obtained throughout the test when administered once. Second, reliability refers to the extent to which a measuring device yields consistent result upon testing that is, how dependable.

The Cronbach’s Alpha is calculated for providing the reliability of data. If the value Cronbach’s Alpha is greater than .70, the scale is reliable. The Cronbach’s Alpha of the tool ‘opinionnaire’ is 0.778, which is reliable.

**Statistical Technique used in the study**

The score obtained from 250 higher secondary school teachers were subjected to statistical treatment. The following were the statistical technique used for the present study.

**Percentage analysis**

The percentage in the sample and each subsample was found separately using the formula,

**Test of Significance of Difference between Means for Different Categories**

In order to compare the distribution of variable in the subgroups, the data was subjected to test of significance for mean difference. The test of significant of different between means for different categories is known as‘t’ test. The tabled value for 0.01 level of significance is 2.58, and tabled value 0.05 level of significance is 1.96.

= mean of first group

= mean of second group

= standard deviation of first group

= standard deviation of second group

= size of (the sample) first group

= size of (the sample) second group

The mean difference is said to be significant depending on whether critical ratio exceed 2.58 or 1.96 at 0.01 levels and 0.05 level of significance respectively.

**ANOVA**

The analysis of variance is an effective way to determine whether the means of more than two samples are different to attribute to sampling error (Best &Kahn, 2012). In its simplest form, the analysis of variance is used to test the significance of difference between the means of a number of different populations. It is an effective way to determine whether the means of more than two samples are too different to attribute to sampling error. ANOVA is an international statistical procedure by which the researcher can test the null hypothesis that two or more population is equal. The ratio of two variance estimates is computed, and this ratio has its sampling distribution, the F distribution, is determined by two and one degree of freedom values. ANOVA can include one or more independent variables.

In this study, ANOVA is used to find out whether the variables gender, locality, status, type of management and subject specification have any significant main and interaction effect on opinion of Labba committee report.

**Chapter IV**

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

* **Objectives of the study**
* **Hypothesis of the study**
* **Percentage analysis**
* **t-Test**
* **one way ANOVA**

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

The present study was undertaken with a view to analyse the opinion of higher secondary school teachers regarding the implementation of Labba Committee Report. The purpose of the study was realized by analysing and interpreting the information collected from the teachers of various higher secondary schools in the form of their opinion towards Labba Committee Report.

The tool used for collecting the required data is an opinionnaire. The data from 250 higher secondary school teachers were collected as described in chapter III. This was analysed as per the objectives of the study.

**Objectives**

1. To analyse the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on infrastructural facility, curriculum, teacher’s professional development, students academic excellence and evaluation system.

2. To list the problems faced by higher secondary school teachers in transacting curriculum.

3. To propose possible suggestions for strengthening higher secondary school educational programme.

4. To find out whether there exist any significant differences in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on;

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

d. Type of management

e. Subject specification

**Hypothesis**

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

2. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

3. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

4. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of students academic excellence of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualification

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

**Percentage analysis**

In the present study percentage analysis is used to find the opinion of Labba committee report on different dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development and evaluation system. The estimation of percentage of the subsamples were based on categories like Gender (male and female), Type of management (Government, Aided and Unaided), Educational Qualification (Basic qualification and Additional qualification), Experience (Up to 10 year and above 10 year), Status (Junior and Senior), Locality ( Urban and Rural) and Subject specification (Science, Commerce and Humanities). The table 8 shows the percentage of opinion of Labba Committee Report on different dimensions.

Table 8

*Mean and Percentages of opinion of Labba Committee Report on different dimensions.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | Mean | Standard deviation | percentage |
| Curriculum | 35.52 | 4.39 | 84.57 |
| Academic excellence | 23.94 | 3.25 | 79.8 |
| Infrastructural facilities | 9.79 | 1.47 | 81.58 |
| Professional development | 24.08 | 2.78 | 80.27 |
| Evaluation system | 11.43 | 1.82 | 76.2 |
| Opinion | 101.76 | 10.03 | 84.1 |

From the Table 8 it can be found that the curriculum dimension has Mean score 35.52 and Standard Deviation is 4.39. The Percentage of higher secondary teacher’s opinion for curriculum dimension is 84.57% and is the most score among all dimensions. This means 84.57% of teachers agree to the curriculum reforms of Labba Committee Report.

In Academic excellence dimension the Mean and Standard Deviation scores are 23.94 and 3.25 respectively. 79.8% of higher secondary school teachers opined that they agree with the academic excellence in the Labba Committee Report.

Infrastructural facilities show a Mean score of 9.79 and Standard Deviation of 1.47. The Percentage of opinion of higher secondary teachers on infrastructural facility is 81.58%. This means that majority of teachers agree about the recommendation of Labba Committee Report based on infrastructural facility.

Professional development of teachers shows a Mean score of 24.08 and Standard Deviation is 2.78. The Percentage of opinion find from higher secondary school teachers are 80.27%. This means 80.27% of higher secondary school teachers agree with the professional development of Labba Committee Report.

The Evaluation system shows a Mean score of 11.43 and Standard Deviation of 1.82. The percentage of opinion of higher secondary school teacher is 76.2%. This means that 76.2% teachers are agree with the evaluation system changes in higher secondary school.

The overall opinion of higher secondary school teachers shows a mean score of 101.76 and Standard Deviation of 10.03. Total percentage of higher secondary school teachers who agree and possesses a favourable attitude towards Labba Committee Report is 84.1%.

**Discussion**

On the basis of the analysis done on the data collected by the investigator, it is revealed that most of the higher secondary school teachers were agree with the change in curriculum, academic excellence of students, infrastructural facilities, professional development of teachers and change in the evaluation system.

**Problems faced by Higher Secondary School Education**

A list of problems faced by higher secondary school teachers are analysed from the scores of data collected. After conducting a percentage analysis and a detailed discussion with the supervising teacher and higher secondary school teachers, the following issues are identified.

1. Most of the teachers facing so many problems in completing the portion in specified time because of limited duration of period.
2. Lack of awareness among students about the effect of drug addiction.
3. Over importance given to academic and examination system.
4. Absence of clerk and peon create problems in the smooth functioning of schools.
5. Students feel uneasiness in the interval as they can’t get much time for refreshment.
6. Value education is given least importance though they are in the adolescent age.
7. Special fees charged from students at the time of appointment for improving school facilities.
8. Few numbers of regional offices are there for higher secondary education to provide adequate assistance in academic issues.
9. Work load of teachers.
10. Less scope for the student’s choice for selecting the interested discipline.
11. Less importance given to sports.
12. Double valuation system.
13. Less importance given to non academic activities.
14. Less importance to the career guidance.
15. Revision of each subject by study is not feasible because of six working days.
16. Adequate training is not provided in information technology.
17. Attitude and interest of students are not considered.
18. Absence of counselling cells in higher secondary schools.

**Comparison of mean scores of higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report based on Male and Female**

In this analysis, the investigator compared the differences in mean scores of male and female higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report. The comparison of overall means scores of opinion towards Labba Committee Report is obtained and the result is presented in the Table 9.

Table 9

*Data and results of the test of significance of difference in opinion of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facility, professional development, evaluation system and the overall opinion on Labba committee report based on gender.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | Gender | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | “t” value | Level of significance |
| Curriculum | Male  Female | 124  126 | 32.41  32.63 | 4.334  4.459 | .388 | NS |
| Academic excellence | Male  Female | 124  126 | 24.17  23.71 | 3.220  3.276 | 1.107 | NS |
| Infrastructural facilities | Male  Female | 124  126 | 9.73  9.85 | 1.488  1.327 | .647 | NS |
| Professional development | Male  Female | 124  126 | 23.75  24.40 | 2.904  2.624 | 1.871 | NS |
| Evaluation system | Male  Female | 124  126 | 11.23  11.61 | 1.844  1.789 | 1.642 | NS |
| Opinion | Male  Female | 124  126 | 101.3  102.21 | 10.380  9.687 | .715 | NS |

From the Table 9 it is seen that obtained mean score of male teachers in curriculum is 32.41 and the mean score of female teachers is 32.63. The standard deviations obtained are 4.334 and 4.459 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is .388 the tabled value for at 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant gender differences in their opinion towards curriculum.

In the case of academic excellence of students it is seen that the obtained mean scores of male teachers is 24.17 and female teachers is 23.71. The standard deviations are 3.220 and 3.276 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 1.107. Since the calculated‘t’ value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significance difference in the opinion of higher secondary male and female teachers towards academic excellence.

The mean score of infrastructural facility of male teachers are 9.73 and female teachers are 9.85 and the standard deviation is 1.488 and 1.327 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is .647. Since the calculated value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of male and female higher secondary school teachers about infrastructural facilities.

The mean score of professional development of male teacher is 23.75 and female teacher is 24.40. The standard deviations obtained are 2.904 and 2.624 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 1.871. Since the calculated value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of male and female higher secondary school teachers about professional development.

The mean score of evaluation system of male teacher is 11.23 and female teacher is 11.61. The standard deviations obtained are 1.844 and 1.7899 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 1.642. Since the calculated value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of male and female higher secondary school teachers about evaluation system.

The mean score of overall opinion of male teacher is 101.30 and female teacher is 102.21. The standard deviations obtained are 10.380 and 9.687 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .715. Since the calculated value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers in their overall opinion about Labba Committee Report.

**Discussion**

The analysis of the above data shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of male and female higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and overall opinion.

**Comparison of mean scores of higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report based on experience of ten year and above ten year**

In this analysis, the investigator compared the differences in mean scores of experience of higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report. The comparison of overall means scores of opinion towards Labba Committee Report is obtained and the result is presented in the Table 10.

Table 10

*Data and results of the test of significance of difference in opinion of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and the overall opinion of Labba Committee Report based on Experience of ten year and above ten year.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | experience | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | “t” value | Level of significance |
| Curriculum | Below 10year  Above 10 year | 202  48 | 32.15  34.06 | 4.302  4.465 | 2.744 | 0.01 |
| Academic excellence | Below 10year  Above 10 year | 202  48 | 23.57  25.50 | 3.160  3.189 | 3.789 | 0.01 |
| Infrastructural facilities | Below  10year  Above 10 year | 202  48 | 9.70  10.19 | 1.429  1.249 | 2.182 | 0.05 |
| Professional development | Below 10year  Above 10 year | 202  48 | 23.96  24.58 | 2.674  3.168 | 1.398 | NS |
| Evaluation system | Below 10year  Above 10 year | 202  48 | 11.32  11.88 | 1.781  1.942 | 1.918 | NS |
| Opinion | Below 10year  Above 10 year | 202  48 | 100.70  106.21 | 9.621  10.571 | 3.499 | 0.01 |

From the Table 10, it is found that the mean score of opinion of curriculum obtained for higher secondary school teachers based on Experience below 10 year is 32.15 and above ten year is 34.06. The standard deviations obtained are 4.302 and 4.465 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 2.744 and the table value of ‘t’ at 0.01 level of significance is 2.58. Since the calculated value is greater than table value, it can be inferred that there is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the curriculum dimension of Labba Committee Report based on their teaching experience.

It is found that the mean score of opinion of academic excellence obtained for higher secondary school teachers based on Experience below 10 year is 23.57 and above ten year is 25.50. The standard deviations obtained are 3.160 and 3.189 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 3.379 and the table value of‘t’ at 0.01 level of significance is 2.58. Since the calculated value is greater than table value, it can be inferred that there is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the academic excellence dimension of Labba Committee Report based on their teaching experience.

It is found that the mean score of opinion of infrastructural facilities obtained for higher secondary school teachers based on Experience below 10 year is 9.70 and above ten year is 10.19. The standard deviations obtained are 1.429 and 1.249 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 2.182 and the table value of‘t’ at 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the calculated value is greater than table value, it can be inferred that there is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the infrastructural facility dimension of Labba Committee Report based on their teaching experience.

It is found that the mean score of opinion of professional development obtained for higher secondary school teachers based on Experience below 10 year is 23.96 and above ten year is 24.58. The standard deviations obtained are 2.647 and 3.168 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.398. Since the calculated value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the professional development dimension of Labba Committee Report based on their teaching experience.

It is found that the mean score of opinion of evaluation system obtained for higher secondary school teachers based on Experience below 10 year is 11.32 and above ten year is 11.88. The standard deviations obtained are 1.781 and 1.942 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.918. Since the calculated value is less than table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the evaluation system dimension of Labba Committee Report based on their teaching experience.

It is found that the mean score of overall opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on Experience below 10 year is 100.70 and above ten year is 100.21. The standard deviations obtained are 9.621 and 10.571 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 3.499 and the table value of ’t’ at 0.01 level of significance is 2.58. Since the calculated value is greater than table value, it can be inferred that there is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teacher’s based on their teaching experience.

**Discussion**

The analysis of the above data shows that there is significance difference in the mean scores of below 10 year and above 10 year experienced higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence and infrastructural facilities. It is also inferred that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on their opinion towards professional development and evaluation system of Labba Committee Report based on their teaching experiences of below 10 years and above 10 years.

**Comparison of mean scores of higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report based on status**

In this analysis, the investigator compared the differences in mean scores of junior and senior higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report. The comparison of overall means scores of opinion towards Labba Committee Report is obtained and the result is presented in the Table 11.

Table 11

*Data and results of the test of significant of difference in opinion of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellance, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and the overall opinion of Labba Committee Report based on junior and senior*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | Status | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | “t” value | Level of significance |
| Curriculum | junior  senior | 95  155 | 32.35  32.63 | 4.419  4.383 | .484 | NS |
| Academic excellence | junior  senior | 95  155 | 23.60  24.15 | 3.366  3.170 | 1.297 | NS |
| Infrastructural facilities | junior  senior | 95  155 | 9.71  9.85 | 1.352  1.442 | .762 | NS |
| Professional development | junior  senior | 95  155 | 24.13  24.05 | 2.433  2.980 | .206 | NS |
| Evaluation system | junior  senior | 95  155 | 11.41  11.43 | 1.614  1.944 | .091 | NS |
| Opinion | junior  senior | 95  155 | 101.9  102.10 | 9.605  10.292 | .699 | NS |

From the Table 11, it is seen that obtained mean score of junior teachers in curriculum is 32.35 and the mean score of senior teachers is 32.63. The standard deviations obtained are 4.419 and 4.383 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is .486. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards curriculum of Labba Committee Report based on their status as junior and senior.

It is seen that obtained mean score of junior teachers in academic excellence is 23.60 and the mean score of senior teachers is 24.15. The standard deviations obtained are 3.366 and 3.170 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is 1.297. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards academic excellence of Labba Committee Report based on their status as junior and senior.

It is seen that obtained mean score of junior teachers in infrastructural facilities is 9.71 and the mean score of senior teachers is 9.85. The standard deviations obtained are 1.325 and 1.442 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .762. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards infrastructural facilities of Labba Committee Report based on their status as junior and senior.

It is seen that obtained mean score of junior teachers in professional development is 23.60 and the mean score of senior teachers is 24.15. The standard deviations obtained are 3.366 and 3.170 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.297. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards professional development of Labba Committee Report based on their status as junior and senior.

It is seen that obtained mean score of junior teachers in evaluation system is 11.41and the mean score of senior teachers is 11.43. The standard deviations obtained are 1.614 and 1.944 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is .091. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards evaluation system of Labba Committee Report based on their status as junior and senior.

It is seen that obtained mean score of junior teachers in overall opinion is 101.9 and the mean score of senior teachers is 102.10. The standard deviations obtained are 9.605 and 10.292 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .699. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on their status as junior and senior.

**Discussion**

The analysis of the above data shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of junior and senior higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and overall opinion.

**Comparison of mean scores of higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report based on basic and additional qualifications**

In this analysis, the investigator compared the differences in mean scores of basic and additional qualified higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report. The comparison of overall means scores of opinion towards Labba Committee Report is obtained and the result is presented in the Table 12.

Table 12

*Data and results of the test of significance of difference in opinion of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and the overall opinion of Labba Committee Report based on basic and additional qualifications.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | Educational qualifications | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | “t” value | Level of significance |
| Curriculum | Basic  Additional | 226  24 | 32.60  31.79 | 4.301  5.200 | .854 | NS |
| Academic excellence | Basic  Additional | 226  24 | 23.98  23.54 | 3.219  3.575 | .631 | NS |
| Infrastructural facilities | Basic  Additional | 226  24 | 9.82  9.50 | 1.422  1.251 | 1.069 | NS |
| Professional development | Basic  Additional | 226  24 | 24.14  23.54 | 2.754  3.021 | .998 | NS |
| Evaluation system | Basic  Additional | 226  24 | 11.45  11.21 | 1.823  1.841 | .609 | NS |
| Opinion | Basic  Additional | 226  24 | 101.99  99.58 | 9.788  12.076 | 1.117 | NS |

From the Table 12, it is found that obtained mean scores of curriculum obtained for basic and additional qualified higher secondary school teachers are 32.60 and 31.79 . The standard deviations obtained are 4.301 and 5.200 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is .854. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards curriculum based on their qualifications as basic and additional.

The mean score of academic excellence obtained for basic and additional qualified higher secondary school teachers are 23.98 and 23.54. The standard deviations obtained are 3.219 and 3.575 respectively. The calculated value of‘t’ is .631. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards academic excellence based on their qualifications as basic and additional.

The mean score of infrastructural facilities obtained for basic and additional qualified higher secondary school teachers are 9.82 and 9.50. The standard deviations obtained are 1.422 and 1.251 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.069. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards infrastructural facilities based on their qualification as basic and additional.

The mean score of professional development obtained for basic and additional qualified higher secondary school teachers are 24.14 and 23.54. The standard deviations obtained are 2.754 and 3.021 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .998. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards professional development based on their qualification as basic and additional.

. The mean score of evaluation system obtained for basic and additional qualified higher secondary school teachers are 11.45 and 11.21. The standard deviations obtained are 1.823 and 1.841 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .609. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards evaluation system based on their qualification as basic and additional.

. The mean score of overall opinion obtained for basic and additional qualified teachers is 101.99 and 99.58. The standard deviations obtained are 9.788 and 12.076 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .1.117. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards overall opinion based on their qualification as basic and additional.

**Discussion**

The analysis of the above data show that there is no significant difference in the mean score of basic and additional qualified teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and overall opinion.

**Comparison of mean scores of higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report based on urban and rural.**

In this analysis, the investigator compared the differences in mean scores of urban and rural higher secondary school teacher’s opinion on various dimensions of Labba committee report. The comparison of overall means scores of opinion towards Labba Committee Report is obtained and the result is presented in the Table 13.

Table 13

*Data and results of the test of significance of difference in opinion of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and the overall opinion of Labba Committee Report based on urban and rural .*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | locality | N | Mean | Standard  Deviation | “t” value | Level of significance |
| Curriculum | Urban  Rural | 60  190 | 32.50  32.53 | 3.643  4.609 | .040 | NS |
| Academic excellence | Urban  Rural | 60  190 | 23.63  24.04 | 2.649  3.419 | .838 | NS |
| Infrastructural facility | Urban  Rural | 60  190 | 10.22  9.66 | 1.136  1.460 | 2.715 | 0.01 |
| Professional development | Urban  Rural | 60  190 | 24.70  23.88 | 2.265  2.902 | 1.993 | 0.05 |
| Evaluation system | Urban  Rural | 60  190 | 11.77  11.32 | 1.826  1.813 | 1.677 | NS |
| Opinion | Urban  Rural | 60  190 | 102.82  101.42 | 8.014  10.580 | .940 | NS |

From the Table 13, it is found that obtained mean score of curriculum obtained for urban and rural higher secondary school teachers is 32.50 and 32.53. The standard deviations obtained are 3.643 and 4.609 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .040. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards curriculum based on their locality as urban and rural.

It is found that obtained mean score of academic excellence obtained for urban and rural higher secondary school teachers are 23.63 and 24.04. The standard deviations obtained are 2.649 and 3.419 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .838. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards academic excellence based on their locality as urban and rural.

It is found that obtained mean score of infrastructural facility obtained for urban and rural higher secondary school teachers are 10.22 and 9.66. The standard deviations obtained are 1.136and 1.460 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ 2.715. Since the calculated value is greater than the table value of‘t’ at 0.01 level of significance. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards infrastructural facility based on their locality as urban and rural.

It is found that obtained mean score of professional development obtained for urban and rural higher secondary school teachers are 24.70 and 23.88. The standard deviations obtained are 2.265 and 2.902 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.993. Since the calculated value is greater than the table value of ‘t’ at 0.05 level of significance. It can be inferred that there is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards professional development based on their locality as urban and rural.

It is found that obtained mean score of evaluation system obtained for urban and rural higher secondary school teachers is 11.77 and 11.32. The standard deviations obtained are 1.826 and 1.813 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.677. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards evaluation system based on their locality.

It is found that obtained mean score of overall opinion obtained for urban and rural higher secondary school teachers is 102.82 and 101.42. The standard deviations obtained are 8.014 and 10.580 respectively. The calculated value of ‘t’ is .940. Since the calculated value is less than the table value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers about overall opinion based on their locality.

**Discussion**

The analysis of the above data shows that there is no significance difference in the opinion of urban and rural higher secondary school teachers on their opinion towards dimensions like curriculum, academic excellence and evaluation system of Labba Committee Report. And the analysis shows there is significant difference in the opinion of urban and rural higher secondary school teachers on their opinion towards infrastructural facilities and professional development of Labba Committee Report.

**Comparison of mean scores of opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report between Government, Aided and Unaided teachers.**

In the present study ANOVA is used to find out whether there exists any significant mean difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on type of management or subject of study. The results of comparison based on types of management are given in table 14.

Table 14

*Result of the comparison of mean score of opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on Type of Management.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component | Source of component | Sum of square | df | Mean square | F |
| curriculum | Between group | 64.801 | 2 | 32.400  19.164 | 1.691 |
| Within group | 4733.599 | 247 |
| Total | 4798.400 | 249 |
| Academic  excellence | Between group | 218.432 | 2 | 109.216  9.764 | 11.186 |
| Within group | 2411.668 | 247 |
| Total | 2630.100 | 249 |
| Infrastructural facilities | Between group | 1.039 | 2 | .519  1.992 | .261 |
| Within group | 492.145 | 247 |
| Total | 493.184 | 249 |
| Professional  development | Between group | 4.478 | 2 | 2.239  7.773 | .228 |
| Within group | 1919.922 | 247 |
| Total | 1924.400 | 249 |
| Evaluation system | Between group | 6.989 | 2 | 3.495  3.320 | 1.053 |
| Within group | 820.067 | 247 |
| Total | 827.056 | 249 |
| Opinion | Between group | 466.444 | 2 | 233.222  99.464 | 2.345 |
| Within group | 24567.672 | 247 |
| Total | 25034.116 | 249 |

From the Table 14 it can be found that the ‘F’ value obtained for curriculum is 1.691, academic excellence is 11.186, infrastructural facilities is .261, professional development is .288, evaluation system is 1.053 and overall opinion is 2.345. Since the calculated values are less than the table value. It can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards curriculum, academic excellence, infrastructural facilities, professional development, evaluation system and overall opinion based on their type of management. The ‘F; value of academic excellence is 11.186 which is greater than the table value 3.01 at 0.05 levels. It means that there is significant difference in academic excellence with respect of type of management.

To identify the groups differ significantly, Scheff’s post hoc test was used. The result of scheff’s post hoc test are given in table 15.

Table 15

*Post hoc test*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Management | N | Subject for alpha = 0.05 | |
| 1 | 2 |
| Un aided | 50 | 22.12 |  |
| Aided | 120 |  | 24.20 |
| Government | 80 |  | 26.69 |
| significance |  | 1.000 | .640 |

The table 15 shows that there is no significant difference between the Government and Aided school. But the government and unaided and aided and unaided school shows a significant difference in their academic excellence.

**Comparison of mean scores of opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report between science, commerce and humanities**

In the present study ANOVA is used to find out whether there exists any significant mean difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on subject specification. The results of comparison based subject specification are given in table 16.

Table 16

*Result of the comparison of means score opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on subject specifications*.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component | Source of component | Sum of square | df | Mean square | F |
| Curriculum | Between group | 30.118 | 2 | 15.059  19.305 | .780 |
| Within group | 4768.382 | 247 |
| Total | 4798.400 | 249 |
| Academic  excellence | Between group | 23.289 | 2 | 11.644  10.554 | 1.103 |
| Within group | 2606.811 | 247 |
| Total | 2630.100 | 249 |
| Infrastructural facilities | Between group | 2.169 | 2 | 1.085  1.988 | .546 |
| Within group | 491.015 | 247 |
| Total | 493.184 | 249 |
| Professional  development | Between group | 13.815 | 2 | 6.908  7.735 | .893 |
| Within group | 1910.585 | 247 |
| Total | 1924.400 | 249 |
| Evaluation system | Between group | 3.644 | 2 | 1.822  3.334 | .547 |
| Within group | 823.412 | 247 |
| Total | 827.056 | 249 |
| opinion | Between group | 40.036 | 2 | 20.018  101.191 | .198 |
| Within  Group | 24994.080 | 247 |
| Total | 25034.116 | 249 |

From the table 16 it can be found that the ‘F’ value obtained for curriculum is .780, academic excellence is 1.103, infrastructural facility is .546, professional development is .893, evaluation system is .547 and the overall opinion is .198. Since the calculated value of ‘F’ is less than the tabled value, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on subject specification.

**Conclusion**

The analysis of data shows that there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimensions of teacher’s opinion towards Labba committee report on the dimensions of infrastructural facilities, evaluation system and professional development based on sub variables. But on the basis of experiences there is significant difference in infrastructural facilities and on the basis of locality that shows significant differences in infrastructural facilities and professional development. Academic excellence and curriculum dimensions shows teacher’s opinion about Labba Committee Report varies based on experience. Academic excellence also varied on type of management. The findings and suggestions of the study are given in the next chapter.

**Chapter V**

**SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND**

**SUGGESTIONS**

* **Study in retrospect**
* **Variables**
* **Objectives**
* **Hypothesis**
* **Methodology**
* **Major findings**
* **Tenability of hypothesis**
* **Educational implications**
* **Suggestions for further research**

**Summary, Findings and Suggestions**

This chapter provides a retrospective view of study, major findings, educational implication and suggestions for further research in this area.

**Study in Retrospect**

The present investigation is entitled as “Opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report”.

**Variable**

In the present study, the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report was taken as criterion variable.

The classificatory variables were,

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

**Objectives**

1. To analyse the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on infrastructural facility, curriculum, teachers professional development, students academic excellence and evaluation system.

2. To list the problems faced by higher secondary school teachers in transacting curriculum.

3. To propose possible suggestion for strengthening higher secondary school educational programme.

4. To find out whether there exist any significant differences in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on various dimensions of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on;

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

**Hypothesis**

1. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

2. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

3. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

4. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of students academic excellence of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

**Methodology**

It deals with brief description of the methodology of the present study with precise description of the sample used for the study, tools and statistical techniques used.

**Sample**

The present study was conducted on a representative sample of 250 prospective higher secondary school teachers of Calicut and Malappuram districts. The sampling technique used was stratified sampling method giving due representation to factors like gender, experience, status, educational qualification, type of management and subject specification.

**The tool used for the present study**

Opinionnaire on Labba Committee Report (Anees and Sruthi 2015)

**Statistical technique used for the study**

Percentage Analysis

Test of significance of mean difference ( t- Test)

Analysis of variances (ANOVA)

**Major Findings of the study**

1. 84.57% higher secondary school teachers are in favour of the curriculum reforms of Labba Committee Report.
2. 79.8% higher secondary school teachers are agreeing to the dimension of academic achievement of Labba Committee Report.
3. Majority of teachers (81.58%) agree on the recommendation of Labba Committee Report based on the dimension of infrastructural facility.
4. 80.27% higher secondary school teachers are agreeing to the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report.
5. 76.2% higher secondary school teachers are opined that they are agreeing to the evaluation system proposed by Labba Committee Report.
6. The study reveals that majority of higher secondary school teachers opined that it was necessary to revise the higher secondary school curriculum, academic excellence of students, infrastructure facilities of school, professional development of teachers and evaluation system. (84.1%)
7. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school male and female teachers based on curriculum reforms of Labba Committee Report (t=.388)
8. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school male and female teachers based on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report. (t=1.107)
9. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school male and female teachers based on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report. (t=.647)
10. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school male and female teachers based on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report. (t=.388)
11. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school male and female teachers based on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report. (t=1.642)
12. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school male and female teachers towards Labba Committee Report. (t=.715)
13. There is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on curriculum reforms based on their experience. (t=2.744)
14. There exists significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers below and above 10 year of experience on the dimension of academic excellence. (t= 3.798)
15. There exists significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers below and above 10 year of experience on the dimension of on infrastructural facility. ( t=2.182)
16. There is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development based on their experience. (t=1.398)
17. There is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system based on their experience. ( t=1.918)
18. There exists significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers below and above 10 year of experience teachers towards Labba Committee Report. ( t= 3.499)
19. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school junior and senior teachers based on curriculum reforms of Labba Committee Report. ( t=.486)
20. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school junior and senior teachers based on academic achievement dimension of Labba Committee Report. ( t=1.297)
21. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school junior and senior teachers based on infrastructure facility dimension of Labba Committee Report. ( t=.762)
22. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school junior and senior teachers based on professional development dimension of Labba Committee Report. ( t=.206)
23. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school junior and senior teachers based on evaluation system dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=.091)
24. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school junior and senior teachers towards Labba Committee Report. (t=.486)
25. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school basic and additional qualified teachers based on curriculum reforms of Labba Committee Report. (t=.854)
26. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school basic and additional qualified teachers based on academic excellence dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=.631)
27. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school basic and additional qualified teachers based on infrastructural facility dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=1.069)
28. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school basic and additional qualified teachers based on professional development dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=.998)
29. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school basic and additional qualified teachers based on evaluation system dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=.609)
30. There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on their qualification towards Labba Committee Report. (t=1.117)
31. There is no significant difference in the opinion of rural and urban higher secondary school teachers based on curriculum reforms of Labba Committee Report. (t=.40)
32. There is no significant difference in the opinion of rural and urban higher secondary school teachers based on academic achievement dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=.838)
33. There exists significant difference in the opinion of rural and urban higher secondary school teachers based on infrastructure facility of Labba Committee Report. (t=2.715)
34. There exists significant difference in the opinion of rural and urban higher secondary school teachers based on professional development dimension of Labba Committee Report. (t=1.993)
35. There is no significant difference in the opinion of rural and urban higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report. (t=.940)
36. There is no significant difference in the opinion of govt, aided and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on curriculum reforms. (1.691)
37. There is no significant difference in the opinion of govt and aided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on academic excellence dimension.
38. There exists significant difference in the opinion of govt and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on academic excellence dimension.
39. There exists significant difference in the opinion of aided and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on academic excellence dimension.
40. There is no significant difference in the opinion of govt, aided and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on infrastructural facility dimension. (.261)
41. There is no significant difference in the opinion of govt, aided and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on professional development dimension. (.288)
42. There is no significant difference in the opinion of govt, aided and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on evaluation system dimension. (1.053)
43. There is no significant difference in the opinion of govt, aided and unaided higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report. (2.345)
44. There is no significant difference in the opinion of science, commerce and humanities higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on curriculum reforms. (.780)
45. There is no significant difference in the opinion of science, commerce and humanities higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on academic excellence dimension. (1.103)
46. There is no significant difference in the opinion of science, commerce and humanities higher secondary school teachers towards Labba committee report based on infrastructural facility dimension. (.546)
47. There is no significant difference in the opinion of science, commerce and humanities higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on professional development dimension. (.893)
48. There is no significant difference in the opinion of science, commerce and humanities higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report based on evaluation system dimension. (.547)
49. There is no significant difference in the opinion of science, commerce and humanities higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report. (.198)

**Tenability of hypothesis**

The tenability of hypothesis is examined in the light of the above findings

Hypothesis 1 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

Hypothesis 1 (a) the findings reveal that on the basis of gender there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report (t= .647). So hypothesis 1 (a) is accepted.

Hypothesis 1 (b) the findings reveal that on the basis of experience there exist significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report (t= 2.182). So hypothesis 1 (b) is rejected.

Hypothesis 1 (c) the findings reveal that on the basis of status there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report (t= .762). So hypothesis 1 (c) is accepted.

Hypothesis 1 (d) the findings reveal that on the basis of educational qualification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.069). So hypothesis 1 (d) is accepted.

Hypothesis 1 (e) the findings reveal that on the basis of locality there exist significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report (t= 2.715). So hypothesis 1 (e) is rejected.

Hypothesis 1 (f) the findings reveal that on the basis of type of management there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report ( .261). So hypothesis 1 (f) is accepted.

Hypothesis 1 (g) the findings reveal that on the basis of subject specification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of infrastructural facility of Labba Committee Report (.546). So hypothesis 1 (c) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

Hypothesis 2(a) The findings reveal that on the basis of gender there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report (t= .388). So hypothesis 2 (a) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 (b) the findings reveal that on the basis of experiences there exists significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report (t= 2.744). So hypothesis 2 (b) is rejected.

Hypothesis 2 (c) the findings reveal that on the basis of status there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report   
(t= .486). So hypothesis 2 (b) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 (d) the findings reveal that on the basis of educational qualification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report (t= .854). So hypothesis 2 (c) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 (e) the findings reveal that on the basis of locality there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report (t= .40). So hypothesis 2 (b) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 (f) the findings reveal that on the basis of type of management there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.691). So hypothesis 2 (f) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2 (g) the findings reveal that on the basis of subject specification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of curriculum of Labba Committee Report (t= .780). So hypothesis 2 (b) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

Hypothesis 3(a) the findings reveal that on the basis of gender there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.871). So hypothesis 3 (a) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 (b) the findings reveal that on the basis of experience there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.398). So hypothesis 3 (b) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 (c) the findings reveal that on the basis of status there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (t= .206). So hypothesis 3 (c) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 (d) the findings reveal that on the basis of educational qualification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (t= .998). So hypothesis 3 (d) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 (e) the findings reveal that on the basis of locality there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.993). So hypothesis 3 (e) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 (f) the findings reveal that on the basis of type of management there exists significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (1.691). So hypothesis 3 (f) is accepted.

Hypothesis 3 (g) the findings reveal that on the basis of subject specification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of professional development of Labba Committee Report (.780). So hypothesis 3 (g) is accepted.

Hypothesis 4 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of student’s academic excellence of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

Hypothesis 4 (a) the findings reveal that on the basis of gender there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.871). So hypothesis 3 (a) is accepted.

Hypothesis 4 (b) the findings reveal that on the basis of experience there exists significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report (t= 3.798). So hypothesis 4(b) is rejected

Hypothesis 4 (c) the findings reveal that on the basis of status there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.297). So hypothesis 4(b) is rejected.

Hypothesis 4 (d) the findings reveal that on the basis of educational qualification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report (t= .631). So hypothesis 4(d) is accepted.

Hypothesis 4 (e) the findings reveal that on the basis of locality there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report (t= .838). So hypothesis 4(e) is accepted.

Hypothesis 4 (f) the findings reveal that on the basis of type of management there exist significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report ( 11.186). So hypothesis 4(f) is rejected.

Hypothesis 4 (g) the findings reveal that on the basis of subject specification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence of Labba Committee Report (1.103). So hypothesis 4(g) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report in the relevant sub samples based on

a. Gender

b. Experience

c. Status

d. Educational qualifications

e. Type of management

f. Subject specification

Hypothesis 5 (a) the findings reveal that on the basis of gender there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report (t= 1.642). So hypothesis 5 (a) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 (b) the findings reveal that on the basis of experience there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report (1.918). So hypothesis 5(b) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 (c) the findings reveal that on the basis of status there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report (.091). So hypothesis 5(c) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 (d) the findings reveal that on the basis of educational qualification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report (.609). So hypothesis 5(d) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 (e) the findings reveal that on the basis of locality there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report (1.677). So hypothesis 5(e) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 (f) the findings reveal that on the basis of type of management there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report (1.053). So hypothesis 5(f) is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 (g) the findings reveal that on the basis of subject specification there is no significant difference in the mean score of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of evaluation system of Labba Committee Report ( .547). So hypothesis 5(g) is accepted.

**Suggestions for strengthening higher secondary school educational programme**

The investigator finds out various problems of higher secondary education. The problems are listed in the chapter IV of this study. As per the results of data analysis various solutions are recommended to solve these problems. Some suggestions are shown below.

1. The extra Saturday’s can be utilized for revamping academic and non academic activities.
2. Conduct awareness classes or programmes for both parents and students on the usage of drugs.
3. Give importance to co- curricular activities in addition to curricular activities.
4. Either government or PTA must appoint one clerk and peon in higher secondary education.
5. The interval time must be increased for getting time for refreshment.
6. Humanistic subjects must be included in each streams of education for improving value among students.
7. The principal must ensure that the special fees collected from students at the time of appointment can be properly utilized for school development.
8. Establish more regional offices for providing adequate assistance for higher secondary education in their academic matters.
9. The work load of teachers at the time of examination can be reduced through the appointment of clerk and peon.
10. More electives should be included in higher secondary curriculum which helps the students to select discipline according to their interest.
11. Ensure proper implementation of health education through sports
12. Avoid double valuation system and choose some other sophisticated strategies to strengthen the evaluation procedure.
13. Celebrate arts and sports with students participations.
14. Proper career guidance and counselling must be provided to both parents and students.
15. Extra Saturdays can be utilized for revision of each subject
16. Provide adequate training to teachers in the area of Information Technology
17. Give importance to the attitude and interest of the students while choosing courses.
18. Each school must accommodate with a counselling cell with a trained counsellor.

**Educational Implication of the study**

The study was to know the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report. The result revealed that majority of the teachers are agreeing to the Labba Committee Report (84.1 percentage of the total sample) so the authorities should take proper step to implement the same. Appropriate action plan should be produced in finding solutions to all difficulties pointed out the higher secondary school teachers and thus to improve our educational system.

In the light of the findings of the study, the following points are proposing as the educational implications of the present study.

1. Teacher- pupil ratio of 1:40 helps the teachers to provide individual attention.
2. The in-service training programme by incorporating more practical session through proper planning may help higher secondary school teachers in implementing Labba Committee Report as early as possible.
3. Authorities should give much more importance to the improvement of infrastructural facilities such as library, smart classroom, sports room etc
4. It is necessary to reform the higher secondary curriculum with proper modification in the changing scenario.
5. Provide parental involvement in the school activities.
6. Provide awareness programmes among students on the importance of road safety and anti drug usage.
7. Teachers and students can utilize all Saturdays for their academic and non academic purposes.
8. Career guidance programmes should help the students to provide a direction for their career.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

The findings of the study and limitations encountered in the present study helped the investigator to suggest the following further research.

1. This study is only limited to the opinion of teachers. The opinion of students, administrators, parents and teacher educators also are the areas of further research.
2. The study can be conducted on other states with their respective commissions report on higher secondary education.
3. A Comparative study between Labba Committee and any other educational committee on higher secondary education is also an area of further investigation.
4. The present study can be conducted on seeking the opinion of higher secondary school principal towards Labba Committee Report.

**Conclusion**

The investigator reached the following conclusions after conducting the study. The main dimensions of Labba Committee Report are curriculum, infrastructural facilities, academic excellence, professional development and evaluation system. On the basis of gender, status, type of management, subject specification, educational qualification there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teacher’s on infrastructural facilities towards Labba Committee Report. But on the basis of experience and locality there is significant difference.

There is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on curriculum of Labba Committee Report based on gender, status, educational qualification, locality, type of management and subject specification. But on the basis of experience there exist significant difference.

In the dimension of professional development there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on the sub samples. But on the basis of locality there exist significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report.

There is significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on the dimension of academic excellence based on experience, status and type of management. But based on the subsamples like gender, educational qualification, locality and subject specification there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers on academic excellence. The evaluation system shows there is no significant difference in the opinion of higher secondary school teachers based on sub samples.
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**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX I**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE**

**OPINION OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS**

**TOWARDS LABBA COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Mr. Anees Mohammed.C Sruthi. S**

Assistant Professor M.Ed Student

Farook Training College Farook Training College

**Personal Data**

Name of the School :

Name of the Teacher : Age:

Gender : Male/Female

Total Teaching Experience (in years):

Status : Junior/Senior

Educational Qualification : MSC/MA/M.Com/B.Ed/SET/NET/Additional PG/Research Degree

Type of School : Govt./Aided/Unaided

Subject : Science/Commerce/Humanities

Locality of School : Urban/Rural

**Instructions**

This is an opinionnaire designed for higher secondary school teachers towards Labba Committee Report. Please mark your opinion towards the statements given below. Each statement is provided with three responses viz., *agree, uncertain*, and *disagree.* After reading the statements carefully, please mark your opinion in the form of a tick mark (C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\tick.png ) against corresponding serial number of the statements. Your responses will be kept confidential is assured. It will be used only for research purpose.

| Sl. No. | Statement | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Duration of the class period is inadequate to carry out the learning activities based on revised curriculum. |  |  |  |
| 2 | Ample time is there to conduct the learning activities in classrooms. |  |  |  |
| 3 | I am satisfied in rearranging the teacher –student ratio as 1:40. |  |  |  |
| 4 | Introduction of new subjects in school curriculum will help in creating new teaching posts in schools. |  |  |  |
| 5 | Education which does not impose over emphasis on examination will contribute positively to the mental development of students. |  |  |  |
| 6 | Reduction of working days into five creates difficulties in covering the content. |  |  |  |
| 7 | Grading system does not provide opportunities to prepare for the examination with a competitive mind. |  |  |  |
| 8 | Organizing anti-drug awareness programmes help in developing a positive attitude in students towards avoiding drugs. |  |  |  |
| 9 | Teachers should get clear instructions to develop a consciousness in students about the safety rules at road. |  |  |  |
| 10 | Increase in the duration of class time reduces the concentration of students. |  |  |  |
| 11 | Rearrangement of time-table creates more difficulties in covering the content than before. |  |  |  |
| 12 | Reduction of working days into five provides time to teachers for preparing the academic matters. |  |  |  |
| 13 | Recommendation for the post of clerck in schools will help in smooth functioning of salary bills. |  |  |  |
| 14 | Lack of time during the interval creates difficulties to students. |  |  |  |
| 15 | Revised curriculum of science, commerce, and humanities disciplines is competent to develop scientific, business and humanitarian attitudes in students. |  |  |  |
| 16 | Collecting special fees in aided schools helps in increasing the library facilities. |  |  |  |
| 17 | Recommendation for the post of peon will contribute positively to the smooth functioning of schools. |  |  |  |
| 18 | Recommendation to allow new zonal offices will make available the services needed by the teachers. |  |  |  |
| 19 | Revised curriculum helps to provide opportunities for each student to excel based on own potentials. |  |  |  |
| 20 | Assistance of peons in examination arrangements will reduce the work load of teachers. |  |  |  |
| 21 | If new subjects are introduced it is difficult to get qualified teachers. |  |  |  |
| 22 | Emphasis on physical training creates problems to students than benefits. |  |  |  |
| 23 | Avoiding double valuation at higher secondary level will affect the transparency of the valuation. |  |  |  |
| 24 | I disagree to the double valuation for some special subjects. |  |  |  |
| 25 | Emphasis on extra-curricular activities helps to make the learning joyful. |  |  |  |
| 26 | Plenty of examinations at higher secondary level act as barrier against the personality development of the students. |  |  |  |
| 27 | Rearranging the teacher-student ratio as 1:40 make it impossible to provide individual attention. |  |  |  |
| 28 | Strength of students more than 50 in a batch will creates job vacancies for teachers based on the newly introduced batch. |  |  |  |
| 29 | Reduction of time duration creates problems in satisfying the primary needs. |  |  |  |
| 30 | Changes in the curriculum at higher secondary level helps in linking students to humanitarian values. |  |  |  |
| 31 | Extra Saturdays are utilizing for remedial teaching. |  |  |  |
| 32 | Objective valuation of the learning activities opens a way for the maximization of personality development of students. |  |  |  |
| 33 | Suitable modifications should bring to SET examination in order to lift up the quality of teachers. |  |  |  |
| 34 | Class management can be made smooth if the teacher-student ratio changes into 1:40. |  |  |  |
| 35 | Non-working Saturdays are utilized by students for revision. |  |  |  |
| 36 | There is difficulties in providing career guidance based on aptitude of students. |  |  |  |
| 37 | It is essential to create a positive attitude in parents about the importance of higher education |  |  |  |
| 38 | Recommendation to provide training in new information technologies is appropriate. |  |  |  |
| 39 | It is necessary to include special programmes in teaching to inculcate values and attitudes. |  |  |  |
| 40 | It is needed to organize a counselling body in schools to find out and provide counselling for at-risk students |  |  |  |
| 41 | It is commendable to organize art programmes during non-working Saturdays to develop creativity in students. |  |  |  |
| 42 | Guidance can be given to parents about the problems of students. |  |  |  |
| 43 | Teachers are experiencing lack of time for continuous evaluation. |  |  |  |
| 44 | Enough time should be given for physical and health education programmes at higher secondary level for the complete development of students. |  |  |  |
| 45 | New academic changes are in tune with the needs of teachers who are running or providing medical or engineering coaching. |  |  |  |
| 46 | Special increment should be given to those teachers who are securing higher degrees. |  |  |  |
| 47 | Promotion based on qualification and professional growth brings negative impact on teachers than positives. |  |  |  |
| 48 | Principal should be removed from teaching process in order to dilute his or her work load. |  |  |  |
| 49 | SET examination has not that much influence in raising the quality of teachers. |  |  |  |
| 50 | Courses based on information technology should be given to teachers. |  |  |  |
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**\nÀ-t±-i§Ä**

e-º I-½n-än dn-t¸mÀ«n-t\m-Sv l-bÀ sk-¡­-dn kv-IqÄ A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡p-Å H-cp A-`n-{]m-b kÀ-sÆ-bm-WnXv. Xm-sg Im-Wp-¶ {]-kv-Xm-h\-I-tfm-Sv \n-§-fp-sS A-`n-{]m-bw tc-J-s¸-Sp-¯pI. Hmtcm {]-kv-Xm-h-\-bv¡pw agree, uncertain, disagree F-¶o {]-Xn-I-c-W-§-fm-Wv \Â-In-bn-cn-¡p-¶Xv. {]-kv-Xm-h-\-IÄ {i-²m-]qÀ-Æw hm-bn-¨-Xn-\p-ti-jw {]-kvXp-X \-¼-dn-\p t\-sc Sn-¡v amÀ-¡v (C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\tick.png) tc-J-s¸-Sp-¯p-I. \n-§-fp-sS {]-Xn-I-c-W-§Ä-¡v c-l-ky-kz-`m-hw D-d-¸v \Â-Ip¶p. A-h K-th-j-W B-h-iy-¯n-\p-th-­n am-{X-ta D-]-tbm-Kn-¡p-I-bpÅp.

| {Ia  -\-¼À | {]-kv-Xm-h\ | agree | uncertain | disagree |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | ]pXn-b ]mTy-]²-Xn {]-Im-c-ap-Å ¢m-kv {]-hÀ-¯-\-§Ä \-S-¯m³ ]n-cn-b-Un-sâ ssZÀLyw A-]-cym-]v-X-am-Wv. |  |  |  |
| 2 | ¢m-kv ap-dn-I-fnÂ ]T-\-{]-hÀ-¯-\-§Ä \-S-¯p-¶-Xn-\v ka-bw e-`n-¡m-dp­v. |  |  |  |
| 3 | H-cp ¢m-knÂ 1:40 F-¶ co-Xn-bnÂ A-[ym-]-I hn-ZymÀ-°n A-\p-]m-Xw {I-ao-I-cn-¡p-¶-XnÂ Rm³ kw-Xr-]v-X-\mWv. |  |  |  |
| 4 | ]pXn-b sFÑn-I hn-j-b-§Ä kv-Iq-fnÂ \n-e-hnÂ h-¶mÂ ]pXn-b A-[ym-]-I X-kvXn-I kr-ãn-¡p-¶-Xn-\v k-lm-bn-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 5 | ]-co-£-bv-¡v Aan-X {]m-[m\yw \Â-Im-Xn-cn¡p-I h-gn hn-Zym-`ym-kw hn-ZymÀ-°n-bp-sS am-\kn-I hn-Im-k-¯n-\v {]m-[m\yw \Â-Ip-¶-Xn-\v k-lm-bn-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 6 | {]-hr-¯n Zn-h-k-§Ä A-©m-¡nb-Xv ]mT-`m-K-§Ä XoÀ-¡m³ {]-bm-kw kr-ãn-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 7 | t{K-Unw-Kv k-{¼-Zm-bw a-Õ-c-\_p²n-tbm-sS ]-co-£-bv-¡v X-¿m-sd-Sp-¡m³ A-hk-cw \Â-Ip-¶nÃ. |  |  |  |
| 8 | e-l-cn-hn-cp-² {]-hÀ-¯-\-§Ä \-S¯p-I h-gn hn-ZymÀ-°n-I-fnÂ e-l-cn-s¡-Xn-sc A-h-t\_m-[w kr-ãn-¡m³ k-lm-bn-¡p¶p. |  |  |  |
| 9 | tdm-Uv kp-c-£-sb-¡p-dn-¨v Ip-«n-I-fnÂ A-h-t\_m-[w kr-ãn-¡m³ th-­ amÀ-K-\nÀ-t±-i-§Ä A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v e-`n-t¡-­-Xp­v. |  |  |  |
| 10 | {]-hr-¯n Zn-h-k-§-fn-se k-a-b-¯n-sâ hÀ-²\-hv Ip-«n-I-fnÂ G-Im{K-X Ip-d-bv-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 11 | ssSw-tS-\_nÄ ]p-\x-{I-ao-Ic-Ww \-S-¯n-b-XnÂ ]mT-`m-K-§Ä ]Tn-¸n-¨v XoÀ-¡m³ ap-¼p-­m-bn-cp-¶-Xn-t\-¡mÄ {]-bm-kw C-t¸mÄ t\-cn-Sp¶p. |  |  |  |
| 12 | {]-hr-¯n Znh-kw A-©m-bn Ip-d¨-Xv A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v A-¡m-Zan-I Im-cy-§-fnÂ X-¿m-sd-Sp-¡m³ ka-bw e-`n-¡p¶p. |  |  |  |
| 13 | ¢mÀ-¡v X-kvXn-I A-\p-h-Zn-¡m-\p-Å in-]mÀ-i kv-Iq-fn-sei-¼-f \_nÃp-am-bv \_-Ô-s¸-«v Im-cy-§Ä kp-K-a-am-bn \-S-¡p-¶-Xn-\v k-lm-bn-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 14 | ssSw-tS-\_nÄ ]p-\x-{I-ao-I-cn-¨-XnÂ C-S-th-f-I-fn-se k-a-b-¡pd-hv Ip--«n-IÄ-¡v {]-bm-kw kr-ãn-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 15 | ]p-Xp¡n-b ]mTy-]²-Xn A-\p-k-cn-¨v k-b³-kv/sIm-ta-gvkv/lyp-am-\n-äo-kv hn-j-b-§Ä im-kv-{Xo-b A-h-t\_m-[w/hy-h-kmbnI t\_m-[w/am-\hnI t\_m-[w kr-ãn-¡m³ ]-cym-]v-X-am-Wv. |  |  |  |
| 16 | F-bv-U-Uv kv-Iq-fnÂ kv-s]-jÂ-^okv Cu-Sm-¡p¶-Xv sse-{\_-dn ku-I-cy-§Ä hÀ-²n-¸n-¡m³ k-lm-b-I-am-Ip-¶p-­v. |  |  |  |
| 17 | ]yq¬ X-kvXn-I A-\p-h-Zn-¡m-\p-Å in-]mÀ-i kv-Iq-fp-I-fp-sS \-S-¯n-¸v kp-K-a-am-¡m³ k-lm-bn-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 18 | ]p-Xp-Xm-bn A-\p-h-Zn-¡m³ B-h-iy-s¸-« taJem Hm-^o-kp-IÄ A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v B-h-iy-am-bn-«p-Å tk-h-\-§Ä e-`y-am-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 19 | amdn-b ]mTy-]²-Xn A-\p-k-cn¨v Hmtcm hn-ZymÀ-°n¡pw kz-´w I-gn-h-\p-k-cn-¨v ]Tn-¨v ap-t¶-dm³ A-h-k-c-ap-­v. |  |  |  |
| 20 | ]-co-£m {I-ao-I-c-W-¯n-sâ Im-cy-¯nÂ ]yq-Wn-sâ k-lm-bw e-`y-am-Ip-I-bm-sW-¦nÂ A-[ym-]-I-cp-sS tPm-en-`m-cw Ip-d-¡m³ km-[n-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 21 | ]pXn-b sFÑn-I hn-j-b-§Ä h-¶v I-gn-ªmÂ tbm-Ky-X-bp-Å A-[ym-]I-sc e-`n¡p-I F¶-Xv {]-bm-k-I-cam-b Im-cy-amWv. |  |  |  |
| 22 | Imbn-I ]-cn-io-e-\-¯n-\v Du-¶Â \Â-Inb-Xv hn-ZymÀ-°n-IÄ-¡v Kp-W-t¯-¡mÄ G-sd tZm-jw sN-¿pw. |  |  |  |
| 23 | l-bÀ-sk-¡-­-dn-bnÂ C-c-« aq-ey-\nÀ®-bw H-gn-hm-¡p-I-bm-sW-¦nÂ A-Xv aq-ey-\nÀ-®-b-¯n-sâ kp-Xm-cyX-sb \_m-[n-¡pw. |  |  |  |
| 24 | Nn-e {]-tXy-I hn-j-b-§-fnÂ am{Xw C-c-« aq-ey-\nÀ®-bw \-S-¯p-¶-XnÂ F-\n-¡v hn-tbm-Pn-¸mWv. |  |  |  |
| 25 | ]m-tTy-X-c {]-hÀ-¯-\-§Ä-¡v {]m-[m\yw sIm-Sp-¡p¶-Xv sIm-­v ]T-\w B-kzm-Zy-I-c-am-¡m³ k-lm-bn-¡p-¶p-­v. |  |  |  |
| 26 | l-bÀ sk-¡­-dn X-e-¯n-ep-Å ]-co-£-I-fp-sS \_m-lpeyw Ip-«n-I-fp-sS hy-àn-Xz-hn-Im-k-¯n-\v X-S-k-am-bn \nÂ-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 27 | A-[ym-]-I hn-ZymÀ-°n A-\p-]mXw 1:40 B-bn {I-ao-I-cn-¨mÂ hy-àn-]-c-am-bn {i-²-sIm-Sp-¡m-³ km-[n-¡m-sX h-cpw. |  |  |  |
| 28 | H-cp \_m-¨nÂ 50 Ip-«n-I-fnÂ Iq-Sp-X-em-bmÂ ]pXn-b \_m-¨v A-\p-h-Zn-¡p-¶-XnÂ A-[ym-]-I-cp-sS sXm-gn-e-h-k-c-§Ä Iq-Sp-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 29 | k-ab ssZÀLyw Ip-d¡p-I aq-ew {]m-Yan-I B-h-iy-§Ä \n-d-th-äp-¶-Xn-\v {]-bm-k-§Ä A-\p-`-hn-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 30 | ]mTy-]-²-Xn-bn-se am-äw l-bÀ-sk-¡­-dn hn-ZymÀ-°nI-sf am-\pjn-I aq-ey-§-fp-am-bn A-Sp-¸n-¡m³ km-[n-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 31 | A-[n-I-am-bn e-`n-¨ i-\n-bm-gv-NI-sf ]-cn-lm-c-t\_m-[-\-¯n-\v (Remedial Teaching) D-]-bp-à-am-¡m³ km-[n-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 32 | ]mTy-{]-hÀ-¯-\-§-fp-sS i-cn-bm-b aq-ey-\nÀ®-bw \-S¯p-I h-gn Ip-«n-I-fp-sS hy-àn-Xz hn-Ik-\w k-¼qÀ-®-am-¡m³ km-[n-¡m-dp-­v. |  |  |  |
| 33 | A-[ym-]-I-cp-sS Kp-W-\n-e-hm-cw D-bÀ-¯m³ sk-äv ]-co-£-bnÂ A-\p-kr-Xam-b am-ä-§Ä h-cp-t¯-­-Xp­v. |  |  |  |
| 34 | A-[ym-]-I hn-ZymÀ-°n A-\p-]mXw 1:40 B-¡n-bmÂ ¢m-Êv \-S-¯n-¸v kp-K-a-am-¡mw. |  |  |  |
| 35 | ]Tn-¨ Im-cy-§Ä ]p-\c-h-tem-I-\w(Revision) sN-¿m³ A-h-[n-bm-bn e-`n-¨ i-\n-bm-gv-N-IÄ D-]-tbm-Kn-¡m³ Ip-«n-IÄ-¡v km-[n-¡p-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 36 | Ip«n-I-fp-sS A-`n-cp-Nn-¡-\p-k-cn-¨p-Å I-cn-bÀ ssK-U³-kv \Â-Im³ {]m-tbm-Kn-Iam-b {]-bm-k-ap­v. |  |  |  |
| 37 | D-¶-X hn-Zym-`ym-k-¯n-sâ B-h-iy-I-X-sb-¡p-dn-¨v c-£n-Xm-¡Ä-¡n-S-bnÂ A-h-t\_m-[w kr-ãn-¡-s¸-tS-­-Xv X-s¶-bmWv. |  |  |  |
| 38 | ]pXn-b hn-h-c-km-t¦Xn-I hn-Zy-bp-am-bn \_-Ô-s¸-« ]-cn-ioe-\w \Â-Im-\p-Å in--]mÀ-i D-Nn-X-amWv. |  |  |  |
| 39 | aq-ey-§-fpw, a-t\m-`m-h-§fpw h-fÀ-¯p-¶-Xn-\m-bp-Å {]-tXy-I ]-cn-]m-Sn-IÄ A-[ym-]-\-¯nÂ DÄ-s¸-Sp-t¯­-Xp X-s¶-bmWv. |  |  |  |
| 40 | {]-iv-\-§Ä A-`n-ap-Jo-I-cn-¡p-¶ Ip-«nI-sf I-s­-¯n Iu¬-kn-enw-Kv \Â-Im³ H-cp Iu¬-kn-enw-Kv t\_m-Un kv-Iq-fnÂ cq-]o-I-cn-t¡-­-Xp-­v. |  |  |  |
| 41 | A-h-[n-bm-bn e-`n-¨ i-\n-bm-gv-N-I-fnÂ I-em-hn-cp-¶v kw-L-Sn-¸n-¨v Ip-«n-I-fn-se kÀ-Kmß-I-X D-bÀ-¯p-¶-Xv hf-sc \Ã-XmWv. |  |  |  |
| 42 | Ip-«n-I-fn-se {]-iv-\-§-sf-¡p-dn-¨pÅ ssK-U³-kp-IÄ c-£n-Xm-¡Ä-¡v \Â-Imw. |  |  |  |
| 43 | \nc-´-c aq-ey-\nÀ®-bw \-S-¯p-¶-Xn-\v A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v k-a-b-¡pd-hv A-\p-`-h-s¸-Sp-¶p­v. |  |  |  |
| 44 | Ip-«n-I-fp-sS kÀ-tÆm·p-J hn-I-k-\-¯n-\v Imbn-I B-tcm-Ky hn-Zym-`ym-k-¯n-\v l-bÀ-sk-¡­-dn X-e-¯nÂ AÀ-lam-b Øm-\w \Â-tI-­-Xp-­v. |  |  |  |
| 45 | sa-Un¡Â, F-©n-\n-b-dnw-Kv F³-{S³-kv tIm-¨nw-Kv \-S-¯p-I-tbm, ¢m-kv F-Sp-¡p-Itbm sN-¿p-¶ A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v k-lm-b-I-c-am-hp-¶ X-c-¯n-em-Wv ]pXn-b A-¡m-Zan-I am-ä-§Ä h-cp-¯n-bn-cn-¡p-¶Xv. |  |  |  |
| 46 | D-bÀ-¶ \_n-cp-Zw ssI-h-cn-¡p-¶ A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v {]-tXy-I C³-{In-saâv \Â-tI-­-Xm-Wv. |  |  |  |
| 47 | tbm-Ky-X-bpw, s{]m-^-j-\n-ep-Å hn-I-k-\hpw I-W-¡n-se-Sp-¯mh-Ww {]-tam-j³ \Â-tI-­-Xv F¶-Xv A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v Kp-W-t¯-¡mÄ G-sd tZm-jw sN-¿pw |  |  |  |
| 48 | l-bÀ sk-¡­-dn {]n³-kn-¸-fn-sâ A-[ym-]\ tPm-en e-Lq-I-cn-¡m³ ¢m-kv F-Sp-¡p-¶-XnÂ \n-¶v A-t±l-s¯ am-än sIm-Sp-t¡-­-XmWv. |  |  |  |
| 49 | A-[ym-]-I-cp-sS Kp-W-\n-e-hm-cw D-bÀ-¯p-¶-XnÂ SET ]co-£ hen-b kzm-[o-\-sam¶pw sN-ep-¯p-¶nÃ. |  |  |  |
| 50 | A-[ym-]-IÀ-¡v hn-h-c-km-t¦Xn-I hnZy-bp-am-bn \_-Ô-s¸-«pÅ tIm-gv-kp-IÄ \Â-tI-­-Xp­v. |  |  |  |