INTRODUCTION

Educational attainment is a persistent challenge for many countries with low levels of literacy. Paranjape & Williams [1]. In particular, in the case of India, home is the oldest education system. Sharma & Sharma, and with one of the largest tertiary education systems. World Bank, in present time, technology is affecting almost every domain of life [2,3]. With the development of digital technology, education is also changing its pedagogic strategies, Caurville [4]. The use of ICT has now become an integral part of the world’s education system so the government of India has also taken some steps to bring the Indian education system at the world’s pace. The National Policy on ICT is an example of such efforts taken by the Indian Government.

With time the computer has made its place from primary to higher education. It has become an important tool in the teaching-learning process. Bhalla [5]. As a teacher plays a significant role in the teaching-learning process, he needs to be aware of the proper working of computers and how to use it for the best of his students. Computer anxiety among teachers presents a great hindrance to integrating computer technology in education.

Computer anxiety is a feeling of discomfort and fear of using a computer and having uneasiness that the negative outcomes will be received with computer operations Chang [6].

Day by day, the young children and youth are becoming more technology savvy. Today, students are living in a digital age where they have the vast exposure of information. Goswami [7]. In such a condition, a teacher having computer anxiety can’t fulfill his goal of teaching with the only traditional method of teaching. Today, student needs a fresh perspective in teaching with technology-supportive learning. The computer has affected almost every domain of education such as teaching, administration, curriculum, planning and evaluation. Alpert & Bitzer [8]. Computer technology has also proved itself as an important tool in the field of distance education. Rahman [9]. In the present era, the computer has become the most important tool almost in all fields of work and the education system must obtain the demands of technology to compete with world level education. In achieving this, computer anxiety plays a negative force that hails the process of effective teaching by affecting the psychological state of a teacher Setyarini [10]. Age affects significantly the level of computer anxiety. According to Rahimi & Yadollahi, the older teacher shows more anxiety in using computer and its other application during the work [11].
Duncan has been conducted a study found that in only 15 modules has been used or translated, or modified more than five times out of 5000 modules in the Connexions OER repository². Examining the same collection Petrides et al. also found that significant modification or revision of materials created by others happened very rarely³. The Connexions repository may be a best-case research context because the site provides users with tools for revising and remixing OER inside the system, where data can be collected and analyzed.

**Literature Review**

Noh et al. conducted a study to explore experience in computer practice and level of ICT knowledge towards personal innovativeness⁴. For this research investigation, 546 libraries and media teachers were selected randomly by the researcher. And it was found out that the majority of library and media teachers were having moderate personal innovativeness. And it was also found out that computer experience, educational level, and ICT knowledge influenced personal innovativeness significantly.

Akiyemi studied phobia about educational technology⁵. He found that phobia for educational technology is responsible for avoiding the use of different teaching-learning types of equipment among Nigerian teachers in the teaching process. In this research, 48 teachers showed that low knowledge of educational technology causes technophobia.

Kotlik & Smith investigate the computer anxiety of vocational teachers in the field of agriculture and other vocational teachers⁶. The finding of the research revealed that a few vocational teachers faced computer anxiety which was ranging from mild to intensive.

Mullan conducted a study on 44 participants⁷. The study resulted that teachers were unable to adopt computer technology in classrooms. He also studied anxiety with gender, education level, computer experience and in-service training. He concluded that males had a low level of computer anxiety than females, and training helps to reduce computer anxiety.

Tekinarslan explored the level of computer anxiety among students of Dutch and Turkish universities⁸. This study explores the relation of computer anxiety with their culture, gender, and computer experience. The researcher found out that the level of computer anxiety among Turkish students was higher in comparison to Dutch students, while there was no difference based on gender. This study also revealed that female Turkish students possessed a high level of computer anxiety than female Dutch students. Students showed a decreasing level of computer anxiety as they encountered more with computers.

Halder & Chaudhuri conducted a study related to the computer anxiety of teacher trainees concerning their gender, discipline, and locality⁹. The data was collected through the Computer Anxiety Scale (Ceyhan and Namli, Heinissen, Glass and Knight) on the sample of 84 teacher trainees of the age group between 30-40 years. It was found that all participants were working moderate computer anxiousness. Teacher trainees of urban and semi-urban origins exhibit the lowest computer anxiety while the reverse is true for the rural teacher trainees.

Saxena & Kaur studied computer anxiety among 600 prospective teachers⁴. The researchers revealed in the study that male prospective teachers had more computer anxiety as compared to female prospective teachers. The urban prospective teachers showed less computer anxiety whereas no significant difference was found between the prospective teachers of Humanities and Science background concerning their computer anxiety.

Saxena et al. examined computer phobia among prospective teachers about their gender, locality, and stream. In the results of the study female and rural prospective teachers showed high computer phobia than male and urban prospective teachers, also the Humanities stream prospective teachers showed more computer phobia than Science stream prospective teachers.

**Objectives**

- To find out the status of individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators.
- To find out the computer anxiety and individual failure among teacher educators and to suggest the techniques to cope with computer anxiety.

**Hypothesis**

After reviewing the previous studies the researcher formed the null hypothesis to be verified by present research. The following are the hypothesis for the present piece of research investigation:

- There will be no significant difference in the level of computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators about their gender, locality and institution type.
- There will be no significant difference in the level of computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators about their age group and teaching experience.
- There will be no significant difference in the level of computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators about their educational qualifications and current academic status.

**Sample**

The present study is entirely focused on computer anxiety and individual failure among teacher educators. For this research study, the researcher chose 26 teacher educators attending a workshop through random sampling and surveyed them. All these the participants were from various colleges and universities actively supported the investigator for the study in data gathering.

**Tool & Techniques**

For the present study the researcher used a standardized tool ‘Computer Anxiety Scale’ developed by Saxena, M.K. & Bala, Rajni⁹. For valid results, the researcher uses appropriate techniques to analyze the data. In the present research investigation, 2×2 Analysis of Variances has been employed by the researcher as per the assumption of the test.

**Data Analysis**

- **F Value related to Computer Anxiety among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution type**

Table 1 explored the F Value and significant level related to Computer Anxiety among Teacher Educators about their gender, locality and institution type and other related groups. The analysis of the above table shows the significant difference between computer anxiety among the various groups like gender, locality and type of institutions as follows. The gender of respondents in respect to computer anxiety among teacher educator’s related ‘F’ value is 0.35 with significant probability is .853. It shows that ‘F’ value is not
significant at 0.05 level of significance, thus the null hypothesis is accepted and further it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the computer anxiety among teacher educators based on gender. The locality of respondents in respect to computer anxiety among teacher educator’s related ‘F’ value is 0.02 with significant probability is .969. It shows that ‘F’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is here accepted and further it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the computer anxieties among teacher educators based on their locality. The type of institutions in respect to computer anxiety among teacher educator’s related ‘F’ value is 1.404 with significant probability is .273. It shows that ‘F’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance, further it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the computer anxieties among teacher educators based on their institution type. The gender*locality in respect to computer anxiety among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is 3.822 with significant probability is .067 It shows that ‘F’ value is significant at 0.05 level of significance, Further it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their gender and locality. The gender*institution type concerning computer anxiety among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is .765. It shows that ‘F’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance, further, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their gender and institution type. The locality*institution type concerning computer anxiety among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is .200 with significant probability is .660. It shows that ‘F’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance, further, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their locality and institution type.

Table 1: ‘F’ Value related to Computer Anxiety among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3004.746</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>375.593</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>61528.692</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61528.692</td>
<td>207.346</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>10.463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.463</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>833.542</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>416.771</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Locality</td>
<td>1134.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1134.125</td>
<td>3.822</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Type of Institution</td>
<td>161.142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.574</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality * Type of Institution</td>
<td>59.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.345</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Locality * Type of Institution</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5044.639</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>296.743</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179284.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>179284.000</td>
<td>285.347</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>8049.385</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.R. Squared = .373 (Adjusted R Squared = .078)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ‘F’ Value related to Individual Failure in Computer Usage Among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution Type

Table 2 explored that the gender of the respondents concerning individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is .770 with significant probability is .392. It shows that ‘F’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance and the null hypothesis is got accepted. Further it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their gender. The locality (Urban, Rural) of the respondents concerning individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is .577 with significant probability is .458. It shows that ‘F’ value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance and the null hypothesis is got accepted, further it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their locality and institution type.

Table 2: ‘F’ Value related to Individual Failure in Computer Usage among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>335.737</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41.967</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>8988.089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8988.089</td>
<td>177.174</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>39.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.064</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>29.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.250</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>43.169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.169</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Locality</td>
<td>146.983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146.983</td>
<td>2.897**</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Type of Institution</td>
<td>56.915</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.457</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality * Type of Institution</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Locality * Type of Institution</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>862.417</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.730</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23648.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1198.154</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.R. Squared = .373 (Adjusted R Squared = .078)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ‘F’ Value related to Computer Anxiety and Individual Failure in computer Usage among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution type

Education level (NET, Ph.D.) concerning computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is 7.103 with significant probability is .005. It shows that ‘F’ value is found significant at 0.05 level of significance and the null hypothesis is got rejected. Further it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their education level. The Academic Status (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor) concerning computer anxiety and
individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is 3.896 with significant probability is .038. It shows that ‘F’ value is found significant at 0.05 level of significance and the null hypothesis is got rejected, further it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their academic status. The education level and academic status concerning computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators related ‘F’ value is 1.299 with significant probability are .296. It shows that ‘F’ value is found significant at 0.05 level of significance and the null hypothesis is got accepted, further it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their academic status.

Table 3: ‘F’ Value related to Computer Anxiety and Individual Failure in computer Usage Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5111.676</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>851.946</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>81199.340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81199.340</td>
<td>525.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>2196.509</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1098.254</td>
<td>7.103</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Status</td>
<td>1204.686</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>602.343</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level * Academic Status</td>
<td>401.592</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200.796</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2937.708</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>154.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179284.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>8049.385</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>321.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .635 (Adjusted R Squared = .520)

**Findings**

- **Computer Anxiety among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution type.**
  - There was no significant difference between computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their gender.
  - There was no significant difference between computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their locality.
  - There was no significant difference between computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their institution type.
  - There was a significant difference between computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their gender and locality.
  - There was no significant difference between computer anxiety among teacher educators based on their gender and institution type.

- **Individual Failure in Computer Usage among Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution type.**
  - There was no significant difference between individual failures in computer usage among teacher educators based on their gender.
  - There was no significant difference between individual failures in computer usage among teacher educators based on their locality.
  - There was a significant difference between individual failures in computer usage among teacher educators based on their type of institutions.
  - There was a significant difference between individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their gender and locality.
  - There is no significant difference between individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their gender and type of institution.
  - There was no significant difference between individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their locality and type of institution.

- **Computer Anxiety and Individual Failure in computer Usage Teacher Educators about their Gender, Locality and Institution type.**
  - There was a significant difference between computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their education level.
  - There was a significant difference between computer anxiety and individual failure in computer usage among teacher educators based on their type of institution.

**Suggestions**

- Computer knowledge should be mandatory in all institutions for teachers in the present era.
- Computer education should also be part of the curriculum.
- For removing anxiety, there should be more focus on physical activities during teacher training.
- Guest lecture on the effective use of the computer as teaching aids should be organized.
- Orientation programs related to the computer should be organized at the beginning of the sessions.
- The Institutions should provide a hand to hand experience to operate a computer by organizing a training workshop.
- The smart classrooms should be made for better learning.
- In the institutions, there should be proper time in the time table for computer leaning.
- During the post-graduate level education, laptops should be mandatory for students.
- In rural areas, more focus should be given to computer education.
- In every institution, whether it is government or self-financed, there should be proper computer labs and technicians for computer assistant.
- In rural areas, computer education should be free for girls especially.

**Conclusion**

The world is nowadays totally dependent on technology. The teacher can improve the teaching-learning method with the effective use of computers Saxena, Bala & Upadhyay, but in the present era, it is noticed that teacher educators and teachers are facing anxiety and individual failure on their
demographic differences\textsuperscript{11}. The present study results out in the rural areas girls are not much able to use a computer. Anxiety is the first form of depression so we need to work out on this for the all-round development of human beings.
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