Edifying Proclivity Among Tribal B.Ed. Trainees

Dr. C. Siva Sankar*
*Associate Professor, Department of Education, Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh.

Abstract*:*
Edifying proclivity is the finesse of implementing instructional approaches, principles and methods and also finesses of implementing teaching related activities. In the present study, it refers to potential of B.Ed. trainees to acquire training abilities with regard to 1) professional knowledge 2) attitude towards children 3) school related information4) social aspects 5) educational aspects and 6) communicative aspects with a view to improve teacher performance and teacher effectiveness. The study reveals that there is significant difference between male and female tribal B.Ed. trainees in their edifying proclivity. Female tribal B.Ed. trainees have more edifying proclivity than male tribal B.Ed. trainees. There is significant difference between rural and urban background tribal B.Ed . trainees in their edifying proclivity. Tribal B.Ed. trainees of rural back ground have more edifying proclivity than the tribal B.Ed. trainees of urban background. There is significant difference between Science and Arts background tribal B.Ed. trainees in their edifying proclivity. B.Ed. trainees with science background have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees with Arts background.

Key words: Edifying proclivity and Tribal B.Ed. Trainees

Introduction:
Education makes man rational, self-reliant, self-conscious, civilized, sociable and harmonious. In educational system, teacher is a dispenser of information, disciplinarian, stimulator of inquiry and upholder of habits, customs, manners, standards and values. He/she is a nation builder and a social constructivist. He/she is an initiator, facilitator, resourceful agent, planner, organizer and evaluator in edifying proclivity. Teacher education is the linkage between education and teacher. It helps teacher to discharge their duties and responsibilities effectively at pre-primary, primary, secondary and senior secondary stages. It brings latest trends, techniques, technologies, tendencies, skills, strategies and methods of teaching for teacher-trainees in pre-service programme.
Edifying proclivity is a condition or set of characteristics including knowledge, understanding and attitude regarded as symptomatic or indicative of individual's ability to acquire with training abilities for teaching work. It is a person's potential for teaching, the sum total of all the traits and abilities which are needed for success in teaching. Sometimes, it contains 1) Interest in the Profession, 2) Attitude towards Community, 3) Mental Ability, 4) Professional Information, 5) Attitude towards Children, 6) Skill in Teaching, 7) Ability to maintain Things, 8) Discipline, 9) Health and 10) Interest in the profession.
Edifying proclivity is the sum total of competencies or abilities which are needed for teacher-trainees to become more effective and efficient in profession. Edifying proclivity is the finesse of implementing instructional approaches, principles and methods and also finesses of implementing teaching related activities. It is important to note that edifying proclivity is the first and foremost essential factor for teacher-trainees to get expected achievement with a view to improve teacher performance and teacher effectiveness (NCTE, 1998; UNDP, 1999).

Rationale of the Study:
Rajeeva and Venkatesha (2021) revealed that there was a positive relationship between edifying proclivity and academic motivation and also added that the training of prospective teachers could improve skills and self-confidence in teaching. Singh (2015) told that edifying proclivity was the quality of being fit for teaching profession and it was an introductory determinant factor.
Adval (1952) reported that edifying proclivity would make teachers to be more expressive, bright and alert, attentive, generous, favourable upskilling for dealing children and professional, realistic in life, adjustable, responsible, perceiving, spontaneous and abundant in emotional responses and he also added that there were very few student-teachers in training colleges who had edifying proclivity. Sharma (1971) found that edifying proclivity was one of the significant predictor of teacher effectiveness. Vyas (1982) revealed that edifying proclivity had significant positive relationship with promotion of proficiency in upskilling. Jain (1982) studied that class room behavior patterns of teachers are internally related with that edifying proclivity. The success of upskilling is strongly associated with edifying proclivity among teachers (NCTE, 1998). Keeping in view the importance of edifying proclivity among student-teachers, the present investigator has attempted a study on edifying proclivity among B.Ed.trainees.

Statement of the problem:
"Edifying proclivity among Tribal B.Ed. Trainees"

Operational term:
Edifying proclivity: It refers to potential of B.Ed. trainees to acquire training abilities with regard to 1) Professional Knowledge 2) Attitude towards Children 3) School related Information 4) Social Aspects 5) Educational Aspects and 6) Communicative Aspects.

Objectives of the study:
Objective-1: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in gender.
Objective-2: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in age.
Objective-3: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of locality.
Objective-4: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of management.
Objective-5: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in educational qualification.
Objective-6: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of group.
Hypothesis-7: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-I.
Objective-8: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-II.
Objective-9: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in community.
Objective-10: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental income.
Objective-11: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental education.
Objective-12: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in marital status.

Hypotheses of the study:
Hypothesis-1: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in gender.
Hypothesis-2: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in age.
Hypothesis-3: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of locality.
Hypothesis-4: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of management.
Hypothesis-5: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in educational qualification.
Hypothesis-6: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of group.
Hypothesis-7: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-I.
Hypothesis-8: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-II.
Hypothesis-9: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in community.
Hypothesis-10: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental income.
Hypothesis-11: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental education.
Hypothesis-12: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in marital status.

Methodology of the Study:
Methodology consists of 'method' used in the study, various procedure followed in the preparation of tools for data gathering on different variables which are included in the study, reliability and validity of the tools, an accurate account of size and selection of sample, sampling technique, collecting of data, scoring procedure and statistical techniques used in the study.
Method: The present study is descriptive in nature. Hence, the investigator has used 'survey method' to obtain information. Survey involves describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting conditions or contrasts and attempts to

discover relationships between existing non-manipulated variables. It is concerned itself with the present phenomena in terms of conditions, practices, beliefs, processes, relationships or trends.

Population: All the B.Ed. trainees of Papumpare District of Arunachal Pradesh were considered as population of the study.

Sample: The investigator has adopted stratified random sampling technique to select a sample of 300 B.Ed. trainees from Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) of Papumpare District of Arunachal Pradesh.

Tool used: Research tool is the sole factor in determining sound data and in drawing accurate conclusions about the problem in hard. In the present study, a test was prepared for edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees.

Description of Test for edifying proclivity: The test for edifying proclivity includes personality traits such as co-operative attitude, kindliness, patience, wide-interest, fairness, moral character, discipline, optimum, scholarly taste and enthusiasm. In the present study, the investigator has made test items by meeting experts, going through review of literature, Encyclopedias, books, Journals and periodicals. This test consists of 50 test items of multiple-choice type. Each item has four alternative answers- A, B, C and D. There is no time limit for answering the entire test. However, usually a student-teacher can finish the test in 30 minutes approximately. For clear understanding and convenience, the investigator has divided this test into 6 dimensions in the light of previous studies without changing items and alternative answers and their order of arrangement. The dimensions of the test are: 1) Professional Knowledge 2) Attitude towards Children 3) School related Information 4) Social Aspects 5) Educational Aspects and 6) Communicative Aspects. There are 13 items in Professional Knowledge, 9 items in Attitude towards Children, 7 items in School related Information, 10 items in Social Aspects, 7 items in Educational Aspects and 4 items in Communicative Aspects. Initially, 130 items related to edifying proclivity were made. These items had been examined in light of set of characteristics, abilities to acquire with training and related literature.

The try-out of 130 items was administered on a sample of 100 B.Ed. trainees of Rajiv Gandhi University, Arunachal Pradesh for the batch 2021-22. On the scores of the try-out, item analysis was carried out. Item analysis was used to determine the quality of individual test items. Difficulty value and Discriminating index of each item were computed. After looking into Difficulty value and Discriminating index, 50 items were finally included in the test.

The prospective teachers were enlightened about the need for giving the correct responses to the various items of the test. They were instructed that there were 50 multiple-choice items which had four alternative answers A, B, C and D to select the most appropriate answer out of the four alternatives and indicate their answer by putting a tick mark (√) in the appropriate cell □. The final form of the test was administered on a sample of 150 B.Ed. trainees. Ten cases were rejected since they were not properly answered. The distribution of scores for the total test was tested for its normal distribution. The distribution was very near to normal. In this test, reliability of the test was calculated by split- half method on a sample of 140 B.Ed. trainees. The reliability coefficient was r = 0.828. Content and face validity were reflected in this test.

After selecting sample for the study, the investigator personally visited Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) of papumpare district of Arunachal Pradesh. A good rapport has been developed with the Heads of institutions. They have given permission to administer the tool on prospective teachers. These prospective teachers have been instructed clearly for completing the test.

Statistical Techniques Used: To study the influence of gender, age, type of locality, type of management, educational qualification, type of group, methods of teaching-I, methods of teaching-II, community, parental income, parental education and marital status on edifying proclivity of tribal B.Ed. trainees. Mean, SD, t-test and F-test have been worked out. Whenever two groups are involved in a variable, t-test has been used to know significant difference between two groups. When more than two groups are involved in a variable, F-test has been worked out to know the significant difference among these groups.

Analysis and Interpretation:

Objective-1: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in gender.

Hypothesis-1: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in gender.

Table-1: Showing t- values of Edifying Proclivity Scores of Male and Female B.Ed. trainees:

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	**Gender**				**t-values**
	Male (N = 147)		**Female (N= 153)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1.Professional knowledge	5.850	2.445	6.837	2.305	3.592 **
2.Attitude towards children	4.361	1.862	5.000	2.058	2.824 **
3.School related information	3.946	1.446	4.458	1.377	3.138**
4.Social aspects	5.401	1.854	5.660	1.927	1.185 @
5.Educational aspects	3.204	1.414	3.634	1.436	2.613**
6.Communicative aspect	1.551	1.038	1.784	1.477	1.588 @
Edifying proclivity	24.313	6.470	27.373	7.254	3.859 **

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not significant.

Table-1 shows that t-values with respect to professional knowledge (3.592), attitude towards children (2.824), and school related information (3.138), educational aspects (2.613) and edifying proclivity (3.859) are significant at 0.01 levels. It indicates that male and female B.Ed. trainees studying in Colleges of Education are significantly differ with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, educational aspects and edifying proclivity.

Contrary to this, the t-values with respect to social aspects (1.185) and communicative aspects (1.588) are not significant at 0.01 level indicating no variations in the social aspects and communicative aspects of male and female B.Ed. trainees studying in Colleges of Education. Hence, based on edifying proclivity, the formulated hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in gender" is rejected. Further, the mean values of male and female B.Ed. trainees reveal that female B.Ed. trainees have more edifying proclivity (27.373) than male B.Ed. trainees (24.313).

From the above table-1, it can be concluded that 'gender' has significantly influenced the professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, educational aspects and edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees studying in Colleges of Education; whereas, it has not significantly influenced the social aspects and communicative aspects of B.Ed. trainees. Female B.Ed. trainees have more edifying proclivity than male B.Ed. trainees.

Objective-2: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in age.
Hypothesis-2: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. rainees due to variation in age.

Table-2: Showing F-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees from different Age Groups

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	**Age**						**F-values**
	21-25years (N = 204)		**26-30 years (N = 49)**		**30 years above (N =47)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.10	2.39	6.51	2.29	7.30	2.42	4.90**
2. Attitude towards children	4.38	2.01	5.12	1.74	5.55	1.79	8.38**
3. School related information	4.08	1.43	4.24	1.28	4.70	1.45	3.62**
4. Social aspects	5.30	1.89	6.18	1.62	5.87	1.94	5.32**
5. Educational aspects	3.31	1.43	3.57	1.47	3.74	1.39	2.02@
6. Communicative aspects.	1.59	1.12	1.82	1.89	1.85	1.11	1.44@
Edifying proclivity.	24.77	6.97	27.45	6.38	29.02	6.75	8.82**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

The F-values in the table-2 with respect to Professional Knowledge (4.906), attitude towards children (8.380), social aspects (5.323) and edifying proclivity (8.822) are significant at 0.01 level. F-value with respect to school related information (3.626) is significant at 0.05 levels. It means, the variations in age of B.Ed. trainees has brought significant differences in their edifying proclivity with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects and edifying proclivity.

Contrary to this, the F-values with respect to educational aspects (2.024) and communicative aspects (1.44) are not significant at 0.01 levels and 0.05 levels. It means, the variations in the age of B.Ed. trainees have not brought any significant difference in their edifying proclivity with respect to communicative aspects and educational aspects. Hence, based on edifying proclivity, the formulated hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variations in age" is rejected. The mean values also reveal that the B.Ed. trainees with age group of 30 years above have more edifying proclivity (29.02), followed by B.Ed. trainees with age group between 26-30 years (27.45) and age group between 20-26 years (24.77).

From the table-2, it can be concluded that age has significantly influenced the professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects and edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees; whereas age has not influenced the educational aspects and communicative aspects of B.Ed. trainees. Age group of 30 years above has more edifying proclivity than age group between 26-30 years and age group between 20-26 years.

Objective-3: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of locality.
Hypothesis-3: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of locality.

Table -3: Showing t-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees of Type of Locality.

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	Type of locality				t-values
	Rural (N= 204)		Urban (N= 96)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Professional knowledge	6.559	2.341	5.917	2.540	2.094*
2. Attitude towards children	4.966	1.971	4.094	1.899	3.665**
3. School related information	4.461	1.394	3.667	1.367	4.664**
4. Social aspects	5.750	1.799	5.073	2.012	2.811**
5. Educational aspects	3.520	1.470	3.219	1.356	1.745@
6. Communicative aspects	1.652	1.125	1.708	1.574	0.315@
Edifying proclivity	26.90	6.789	23.677	7.089	3.731**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

From the table-3, it is revealed that the t-values for attitude towards children (3.665), school related information (4.664), social aspects (2.811) and edifying proclivity (3.731) are significant at 0.01 level and the obtained t-value for professional knowledge (2.094) is significant at 0.05 level. It means, the type of locality has significant impact on the attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects and edifying proclivity. It is interesting to note from the mean values that the B.Ed. rainees from rural background have more edifying proclivity (26.905) than the B.Ed. trainees from urban background (23.677). In rural areas, B.Ed. trainees may be influenced by in-service teachers working in and around the villages.

Contrary to these B.Ed. trainees, the B.Ed. trainees from urban are better exposed to the outer world through mass media. Also, these B.Ed. trainees may have interest in IT field or Business field for earning more rather than teaching field. As a result, the urban B.Ed. trainees have better chances to exercise their knowledge and skills to get opportunities in banking, public service, management and IT fields. These may be the reasons for having less edifying proclivity when compare with rural B.Ed. trainees.

On the other hand, the obtained t- value for educational aspects (1.745) and communicative aspects (0.315) are not significant at 0.05 level and 0.01 level. It states that B.Ed. trainees' educational aspects and communicative aspects are similar irrespective of their type of locality. Hence, based on the edifying proclivity, the stated hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of locality" is rejected with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects and edifying proclivity.

From the above table-3, it is concluded that type of locality has a significant influence on professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects and edifying proclivity. And, type of locality has not caused significant difference in educational aspects and communicative aspects.

Objective-4: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of management.

Hypothesis-4: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of management.

Table-4: Showing t-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees of Government and Private Management.

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	Type of Management				t-values
	Government (N=181)		Private (N=119)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Professional knowledge	6.110	2.467	6.723	2.312	2.185*
2. Attitude towards children	4.486	1.979	4.992	1.968	2.171*
3. School related information	4.116	1.415	4.345	1.452	1.347@
4. Social aspects	5.354	1.932	5.807	1.807	2.067*
5. Educational aspects	3.320	1.448	3.580	1.417	1.538@
6. Communicative aspects	1.696	1.359	1.630	1.166	0.448@
Edifying proclivity	25.083	6.976	27.076	6.990	2.418*

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

From the table-4, it is revealed that the obtained t-values for professional knowledge (2.185), attitude towards children (2.171), social aspects (2.067) and edifying proclivity (2.418) are significant at 0.05 level. It means the variations in government and private B.Ed. trainees have brought significant differences in their edifying proclivity with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects, and edifying proclivity. Further, the mean values also reveal that the B.Ed. trainees from private management have more edifying proclivity (27.076) than the B.Ed. trainees from government management (25.083).

Contrary to this, the t-values with respect to school related information (1.347), educational aspects (1.538) and communicative aspects (0.448) are not significant at both levels. It means, the variations in B.Ed. trainees from government and private institutions have not brought any significant difference in their edifying proclivity with respect to school related information, educational aspects and communicative aspects. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "These exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of management" is rejected with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects and edifying proclivity.
From the above table-4, it can be concluded that type of management has significantly influenced the professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects and edifying proclivity; whereas type of management has not significantly influenced the school related information, educational aspects and communicative aspects. Further, B.Ed. trainees from private management have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees from government management.

Objective-5: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in educational qualification.
Hypothesis-5: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in educational qualification.

Table-5: Showing t-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees of Graduation and Post Graduation:

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	**Educational Qualification**				**t-values**
	Graduation (N=203)		**Post Graduation (N=97)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.054	2.397	6.979	2.364	3.157**
2. Attitude towards children	4.478	1.931	5.124	2.042	2.608**
3. School related information	4.123	1.407	4.381	1.474	1.440@
4. Social aspects	5.537	1.842	5.526	2.006	0.046@
5. Educational aspects	3.374	1.424	3.526	1.472	0.842@
6. Communicative aspects	1.626	1.095	1.763	1.610	0.760@
Edifying proclivity	25.192	6.857	27.299	7.230	2.400*

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

The t-values of edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees for professional knowledge (3.157), attitude towards children (2.608) are significant at 0.01 level and t-value for edifying proclivity (2.400) is significant at 0.05 level indicating the variations in the edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with varied educational qualification background. It means, the educational qualification of B.Ed. trainees is significantly influencing their edifying proclivity. The mean values reveal that the B.Ed. trainees with post graduation have more edifying proclivity (27.299) than their counter part (25.192).
On the other hand, the variations in the educational qualification have not brought any significant differences in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to school related information (t-value 0.046), social aspects (t-value 0.046), educational aspects (t-value 0.842) and communicative aspects (t-value 0.760). Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity due to variation in educational qualification" is rejected, only for professional knowledge, attitude towards children and edifying proclivity.
From the table-5, it can be concluded that educational qualification has significant impact on professional knowledge, attitude towards children and edifying proclivity; whereas the variations in the educational qualification have not brought any significant differences in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to school related information, social aspects, educational aspects and communicative aspects. Based on mean values, B.Ed. trainees with post-graduation have more edifying proclivity than B.Ed. trainees with graduation.

Objective-6: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of group.
Hypothesis-6: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of group.

Table-6: Showing t-test values of edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees of Science and Arts Backgrounds.

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	**Type of Group**				**t-values**
	Science (N=146)		**Arts (N=154)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.651	2.536	6.071	2.280	2.077*
2. Attitude towards children	5.014	1.979	4.377	1.951	2.806**
3. School related information	4.342	1.496	4.078	1.361	1.599@
4. Social aspects	5.767	2.136	5.312	1.606	2.079*
5. Educational aspects	3.623	1.439	3.234	1.418	2.360*
6. Communicative aspects	1.897	1.475	1.455	1.033	2.997**
Edifying proclivity	27.295	7.955	24.526	5.750	3.439**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

Table-6 presents the mean and standard deviation scores of B.Ed. trainees' professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity, based on their type of management and calculated t- values. From the table-6, it is revealed that the obtained t-values for professional knowledge (2.077), social aspects (2.079) and educational aspects (2.360) are significant at 0.05 level. And also, the obtained t-values for attitude towards children (2.806), communicative aspects (2.997) and edifying proclivity (3.439) are significant at 0.01 level. It means, the variations in B.Ed. trainees from Science and Arts back ground have brought significant differences in their edifying proclivity with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity. The mean values also indicate that the B.Ed. trainees from science group background have more edifying proclivity (27.295) than the B.Ed. trainees from arts group background (24.526).

Contrary to this, the t-values with respect to school related information (1.599) is not significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels. It means, the variations in B.Ed. trainees from Science group background and Arts group background have not brought significant differences in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to school related information. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in type of group" is rejected for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity.

From the table-6, it can be concluded that the variations in the type of group have brought significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity; whereas the variations in the type of group have not brought significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to school related information.

Objective-7: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-I.

Hypothesis-7: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-I.

Table-7: Showing F-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of Prospective teachers with different Methods of Teaching-I.

Dimension of Edifying proclivity	**Methods of Teaching-I**								**F-values**
	Physical science (N=40)		**Mathematics (N=60)**		**Biological science (N=60)**		**Social studies (N=148)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.47	2.520	6.21	2.663	6.38	2.259	6.36	2.374	0.095@
2. Attitude towards children	4.65	2.340	4.62	2.095	4.68	1.756	4.72	1.938	0.043@
3. School related information	4.28	1.360	4.15	1.486	4.03	1.560	4.28	1.375	0.461@
4. Social aspects	5.07	2.114	5.50	2.333	5.63	1.853	5.63	1.645	0.960@
5. Educational aspects	3.28	1.597	3.23	1.367	3.65	1.424	3.44	1.415	0.947@
6. Communicative aspects	1.63	1.111	1.75	1.072	1.82	1.812	1.59	1.126	0.509@
Edifying proclivity	25.38	8.036	25.46	7.836	26.20	7.307	26.02	6.313	0.188@

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ =Not Significant

From the table-7, it is revealed that the obtained F-values with respect to professional knowledge (0.095), attitude towards children (0.043), school related information (0.461), social aspects (0.960), educational aspects (0.947), communicative aspects (0.509) and edifying proclivity (0.188) are not significant at both levels. It means, the variations in B.Ed. trainees with different methods of teaching I i.e., Physical Science, Mathematics, Biological Science and Social Studies have not brought any significant differences in their edifying proclivity with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity.

Further, the mean values also indicate that the B.Ed. trainees with methods of teaching I i.e., Biological Science have more edifying proclivity (26.20), followed by the B.Ed. trainees with different methods of teaching I i.e., Mathematics (25.16), Physical Science (25.38) and Social Studies (26.02). Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching I" is accepted for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity.

From the table-7, it can be concluded that the variations in the methods of teaching I have not brought any significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to professional knowledge, Attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communications aspects and edifying proclivity. Based on mean values, the B.Ed. trainees with methods of teaching-I i.e., Biological Science have more edifying proclivity

than the corresponding methods of teaching-I i.e., Mathematics, Physical Science and Social Studies chosen by B.Ed. trainees.

Objective-8: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-II.
Hypothesis-8: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-II.

Table-8: Showing t-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees with different Methods of Teaching-II

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	**Methods of Teaching-II**				**t-values**
	English (N=139)		**Telugu (N=161)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.496	2.514	6.230	2.339	0.946@
2. Attitude towards children	4.813	2.093	4.578	1.890	1.015@
3. School related information	4.309	1.517	4.118	1.353	1.145@
4. Social aspects	5.554	1.950	5.516	1.849	0.174@
5. Educational aspects	3.374	1.461	3.466	1.423	0.549@
6. Communicative aspects	1.691	1.092	1.652	1.433	0.263@
Edifying proclivity	26.237	7.480	25.559	6.639	0.825@

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

Table-8 depicts the mean and standard deviation of edifying proclivity scores of B.Ed. trainees with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity, based on their methods of teaching- II and calculated F- values. The mean difference in the edifying proclivity score of B.Ed. trainees for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity, have not significantly varied as the calculated t-values (0.946, 1.015, 1.145, 0.174, 0.549, 0.263 and 0.825 respectively) are less than the table value. It means, the edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees has not influenced by the variation in the methods of teaching-II chosen by B.Ed. trainees.
Further, the mean values also indicate that the B.Ed. trainees with methods of teaching-II i.e., English, have more edifying proclivity (26.237) than the B.Ed. trainees with methods of teaching-II i.e., Telugu (25.559). Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in methods of teaching-II" is accepted for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity.
From the table-8, it can be concluded that the variable, methods of teaching-II has not influenced the edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to the said dimensions. Based on mean values, the B.Ed. trainees with methods of teaching-II i.e., English have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees with methods of teaching-II i.e., Telugu.

Objective-9: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in community.
Hypothesis-9: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in community.

Table-9: Showing F-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees with different Community Backgrounds.

Dimension of Edifying proclivity	**Community**						**F-values**
	OC (N= 64)		**BC (N=115)**		**SC and ST (N=121)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.39	2.643	6.49	2.419	6.21	2.300	0.401@
2. Attitude towards children	4.38	2.110	4.92	1.992	4.63	1.894	1.641@
3. School related information	4.42	1.401	4.11	1.407	4.18	1.466	0.980@
4. Social aspects	5.78	2.080	5.50	1.953	5.43	1.719	0.737@
5. Educational aspects	3.48	1.392	3.44	1.510	3.37	1.397	0.144@
6. Communicative aspects	1.59	1.042	1.64	1.065	1.74	1.563	0.292@
7. Edifying proclivity	26.05	8.115	26.11	6.999	25.55	6.453	0.209@

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

From the table-9, it is revealed that the obtained F-values with respect to professional knowledge (0.401), attitude towards children (1.641), and school related information (0.980), social aspects (0.737), educational aspects (0.144), communicative aspects (0.292) and edifying proclivity (0.209) are not significant at both levels. It means, the variations

in B.Ed. trainees with community background have not brought any significant differences in their edifying proclivity with respect to professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity.
Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in community" is accepted for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects, communicative aspects and edifying proclivity.
The mean values also indicate that the B.Ed. trainees with BC community background have more edifying proclivity (26.11), followed by B.Ed. trainees with SC and ST community background (25.55). But, it is important to note that the edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with OC community background is approximately similar to the edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with BC community background.
From the table-9, it can be concluded that the variations in the community have not brought significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees. As per the mean values, the B.Ed. trainees with OC and BC community backgrounds are approximately similar in their edifying proclivity. The B.Ed. trainees with BC community background have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees with SC and ST community background.

Objective-10: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental income.
Hypothesis-10: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental income.

Table-10: Showing F-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of Prospective Teachers with Parental Income Backgrounds

Dimension of Edifying proclivity	**Parental Income**						**F-values**
	Rs. 0-15,000 (N= 165)		**Rs.15,000-30,000 (N=115)**		**Rs.30,000 above (N=121)**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
1. Professional knowledge	6.29	2.37	6.43	2.41	6.40	2. 58	0.122@
2. Attitude towards children	4.64	2.00	4.71	1.91	4.95	2.22	0.236@
3.School related information	4.27	1.52	4.04	1.25	4.65	1.52	1.848@
4. Social aspects	5.58	1.83	5.41	1.94	5.85	2.03	0.578@
5. Educational aspects	3.48	1.45	3.30	1.40	3.65	1.45	0.845@
6. Communicative aspects	1.70	1.09	1.50	1.05	2.45	2.76	4.878**
Edifying proclivity	25.96	6.96	25.39	6.91	27.95	8.03	1.146@

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

F- Values in the table-10 with respect to professional knowledge (0.122), attitude towards children (0.236), school related information (1.848), social aspects (0.578), educational aspects (0.845) and edifying proclivity (1.146) are not significant at both levels. It means, the variable, parental Income has not significant impact on the professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, and educational aspects and edifying proclivity. It is interesting to note from the mean values that the B.Ed. trainees with parental Income Rs.30,000 above have more edifying proclivity(27.95), followed by B.Ed. trainees with parental Income Rs.15,000-30,000 (25.39) and B.Ed. trainees with parental income Rs. 0-15,000 (25.96).
On the other hand, the obtained F-values for communicative aspects (4.878) is significant at 0.01 level. It states that parental Income has significantly influenced edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees with respect to communicative aspects. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental Income" is accepted for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects and edifying proclivity.
From the above table-10, it can be concluded that parental income has not significantly influenced the professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects, educational aspects and edifying proclivity; whereas parental Income has significantly influenced the communicative aspects of B.Ed. trainees. B.Ed. trainees with parental income of Rs.30,000 above/annum have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees with Parental income Rs.15,000-30,000 and B.Ed. trainees with parental income Rs. 0-15,000.

Objective-11: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental education.
Hypothesis-11: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental education.

Table-11: Showing t-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees with Parental Education Backgrounds.

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	Parental Education				t-values
	Literate (N=134)		Illiterate (N=166)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Professional knowledge	6.657	2.551	6.108	2.289	1.937@
2. Attitude towards children	5.269	1.905	4.217	1.933	4.723**
3. School related information	4.373	1.553	4.072	1.315	1.784@
4. Social aspects	6.127	1.797	5.054	1.838	5.088**
5. Educational aspects	3.634	1.406	3.253	1.447	2.305*
6. Communicative aspects	1.769	1.496	1.590	1.081	1.157@
Edifying proclivity	27.828	7.141	24.295	6.562	4.417**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level and @ = Not Significant

The stated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees due to variation in parental education" is rejected with respect to attitude towards children, social aspects, educational aspects and edifying proclivity, as the obtained t- values for attitude towards children (4.723), social aspects (5.088) and edifying proclivity(4.417) are significant at 0.01 level and educational aspects (2.305) is significant at 0.05 level. It implies that parental education has significantly influenced the edifying proclivity with respect to attitude towards children, social aspects, educational aspects and edifying proclivity.

Contrary to this, the t-values for professional knowledge (1.937), school related information (1.784) and communicative aspects (1.157) are not significant at both levels. It means, B.Ed. trainees have not differed in their professional knowledge, school related information and communicative aspects due to variation in their parental education. The mean value of B.Ed. trainees with literate parents (27.878) is greater than mean value of the B.Ed. trainees with illiterate parents (24.295). It implies that B.Ed. trainees with literate parents have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees with illiterate parents.

It can be summed up that the B.Ed. trainees' edifying proclivity with respect to attitude towards children, social aspects, educational aspects and edifying proclivity are significantly influenced by the parental education. On the other hand, the B.Ed. trainees' edifying proclivity with respect to professional knowledge, school related information and communicative aspects are not significantly influenced by the parental education. Further, it also implies that B.Ed. trainees with literate parents have more edifying proclivity than the B.Ed. trainees with illiterate parents.

Objective-12: To find out significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed. trainees due to variation in marital status.

Hypothesis-12: There is no significant difference in edifying proclivity among tribal B.Ed.trainees due to variation in marital status.

Table-12: Showing t-test values of Edifying proclivity Scores of B.Ed. trainees with Marital Status Backgrounds.

Dimensions of Edifying proclivity	Marital Status				t-values
	Married (N=96)		Unmarried (N=204)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Professional knowledge	5.490	2.332	6.760	2.361	4.384**
2. Attitude towards children	4.021	2.036	5.000	1.889	3.975**
3. School related information	3.917	1.434	4.343	1.414	2.414*
4. Social aspects	4.865	1.846	5.848	1.837	4.311**
5. Educational aspects	3.302	1.415	3.480	1.450	1.010@
6. Communicative aspects	1.563	1.097	1.721	1.363	1.074@
Edifying proclivity	23.156	6.947	27.152	6.727	4.694**

Note:** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level and @ = Not Significant

The t-values for professional knowledge (4.384), attitude towards children (3.975), social aspects (4.311) and edifying proclivity (4.694) are significant at 0.01 level and F-value for school related information (4.311) is significant at 0.05 level. It means, marital status has significant influence on professional knowledge, attitude towards children, social aspects and edifying proclivity.

On the contrary, the F-values for educational aspects (1.010) and communicative aspects (1.074) are not significant at both levels. It means, marital status has not significant influence on educational aspects and communicative aspects. Further, it is observed through the mean values that unmarried B.Ed. trainees have more edifying proclivity (27.152) than the married B.Ed. trainees (23.156). Thus, the stated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in B.Ed. trainees' edifying proclivity due to variation in marital status" is rejected for professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects and edifying proclivity.

From the above table-12, it can be concluded that B.Ed. trainees' professional knowledge, attitude towards children, school related information, social aspects and edifying proclivity have been significantly influenced by their marital status, whereas, B.Ed. trainees' educational aspects and communicative aspects have not been significantly influenced by their marital status. The unmarried B.Ed. trainees have more edifying proclivity than the married B.Ed. trainees.

Educational Implications:

1. The study implies that the edifying proclivity of B.Ed. trainees enhance their teaching performance, positive upskilling behavior and teaching efficacy and effectiveness. Hence, the B.Ed. trainees need to have edifying proclivity.
2. Test for edifying proclivity can be used in selecting the candidates who are fit for upskilling profession and they can be trained well in terms of teachers' skills, strategies and techniques in Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs).
3. If teachers have edifying proclivity towards upskilling, they can show interest in instructional technology, can function school activities, strives for progress of the child and maintains good relationship with parents and society.
4. This study can be extended in finding the relationship between edifying proclivity and other variables such as intelligence, morality, effectiveness etc.

Conclusion:

Edifying proclivity of prospective teachers reflects the specificity, unitary composition, facilitation of learning, constancy, probability of success in teaching profession and required potentialities in the teaching-learning process. It also reflects the duty-mindedness, integrity, teacher behaviour, and teacher effectiveness, teacher performance, willingness to improve professionalism, interest in profession, reading and love for children. Teachers working at primary and secondary levels need to have edifying proclivity in terms of professional knowledge, mental abilities, attitude towards children, social and educational aspects, moral and spiritual aspects, communicative and leadership aspects. Quality and competency of any educational institutional is determined by the role played by its teachers. Therefore, it is must for the University and concerned authority to be impartial in recruiting the faculty on purely merit basis. There is need to plan and organize orientation as well as refresher courses for school teachers. The existing training program has partially failed to provide adequate opportunity to prospective teachers to develop competency to face the varied types of situations in teaching life. So, the Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) in Arunachal Pradesh should invite intellectual candidates in teaching profession through edifying proclivity.

References:

1. Adval, S. B. (1952). *An Investigation into the Qualities of Teachers under Training*, unpublished Ph.D thesis, Dept. of Education Allahabad University, Allahabad, India.
2. Rajeeva, E., & Venkatesha, K. (2021). A Study on Teaching Aptitude of prospective teachers as related to their achievement motivation. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 9(9), 421-428.
3. Sharma, A. D. (1971). *Analysis of Carryover the Teacher Protected to the Classroom Situation,* unpublished Ph.D thesis, Dept of Education, Meerut University, Meerut, India.
4. Singh, K. (2015). Teaching Aptitude of B.Ed.Teacher Trainees of Himachal Pradesh in relation to their gender and stream. International journal of Academics and Research in Education, 3(9), 241-246.
5. Vyas, R. P. (1987). A Study of the Teaching Success of the B.Ed. trainees on Some Selected Variables. *The Educational Review*, *13*(3), 55-58.
6. Jain, B. (1982*). A Study of Class Room Behavior Patterns of Teachers in relation to their Attitude towards Profession, Morale And Values*, Ph.D Thesis, Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi.
7. NTCE. (1998).*Competency Based and Committed Oriented Teacher Education for Quality School Education*, New Delhi.
8. UNDP. (1999). *World Development Report*, NY: UNDP