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**INTRODUCTION**

Teaching and learning processes are the inevitable parts of any formal system of education all over the world. These two processes are integrated for the transaction of curricular objectives. Even through teacher’s role is not limitted to impart a bundle of knowledge to students, it has a major role to play in education. Even now the very term ‘teacher’ is mainly attached to teaching. Through teaching, curricular objectives are imparted to the pupils.

 In the field of education the teachers have pivotal position. They can influence the learners in variety of ways. Through the teaching process, teachers are taking part in the process of bridling a new society. Kothari Commission (1964-66) has rightly remarked that “the destiny of India is being shaped in her class rooms”. Teachers are expected to work in complex multicultural educational settings and to provide good educational experience for all children.

 Providing apt learning experiences to learners is the biggest task assigned to teachers. Though it is purely based on the methods of teaching, it has relation with the teaching style of teachers. The process of maintaining a calm and productive class room environment starts with the teachers. Students look to the teachers for consistency and safety in the class room. Some learners will become anxious and withdraw if it appears that a teacher cannot handle behavioural problems. Other students, however, will retaliate if they feel a teacher is over reacting to a situation in a hostile and unnecessary way. Hence the teaching style can influence the learning processes. Every teacher has his/her own style of teaching and it influences the learning process of the learners.

 Effective teachers are those who understand the knowledge based on teaching, can execute a repertoire of best practices, have attitudes and skills necessary for reflection and problem solving and consider learning to teach a life long process. Effective teachers have the dispositions and skills to approach all aspects of their work in a reflective, collegial and problem solving manner. Teachers become increasingly effective through attention to their own learning and development of their own particular attributes and skills. Becoming truly effective teachers requires replacing naive and sometimes incorrect conceptions of teaching with more complete knowledge structures and understanding about teaching and learning.

 The premise of professional development efforts that try to change attitudes, beliefs or dispositions directly is that these effective changes will lead to change in school or classroom. Practices that will ultimately result in improved learning for students. Results from affective measures showed that teachers who saw improvement became more positive in their attitudes towards teaching and expressed increased personal responsibility for their student’s learning. In other words, they liked teaching more and believed that they had a more powerful influence on students’ learning outcomes.

 Consistencies in the studies on the Teaching Styles lie in the fact that every teacher is unique and has the tendency to use a certain style of teaching. The findings of studies by Gibson & Dembo (1984), Hans (1986) and Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) indicated a strong preference of Teaching Style on Teacher Efficacy.

**NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE**

 The process of teaching mainly involves the intention to bring about learning out comes. In a formal educational system learning is closely related to teaching. Hence teaching is considered to have a significant role in any of the educational systems. A teacher performs his/ her role at various levels. A teacher can influence the learners through different ways. For the smooth functioning of a teaching process, the teachers should adopt different teaching styles. It can motivate the learners to carry out their works.

 Most teachers don’t even think about how they appear before students. Whatever the word is that might describe them; it wasn’t some thing that came about with consciousthought. Teachers need to consciously consider their Teaching Style and work towards developing a positive and effective style. Developing a Teaching Style means more than just one word. To develop a well balanced Teaching Style means teachers must give plenty of thought to what works well for you and what will be best for the students they work with.

 According to Conti (2004), Teaching Style refers to the distinct qualities displayed by a teacher that are consistent from situation to situation regardless of the material being taught.

 Grasha (1994) assessed Teaching Styles using the following categories viz, Expert, Formal authority, Personal model, Facilitator and Delegator. The results suggest that women were more likely to use a facilitator or deligator style that emphasizes relating to students as a guide, consultant or resources as opposed to transmitting knowledge setting goals and providing feed back.

 Delores Commission (1996) has identified four pillars of learning. They are – learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together and learning to be. It provides a broad vision of quality of education. Inorder to be able to impart quality education our education system has to have the following qualities, such as quality syllabus, quality faculty, quality teaching and evaluation, quality research and quality character of faculty. The main role of teachers in quality education is to maintain high level professional efficiency by upgrading domain knowledge and adopt the effective teaching style to import this knowledge to the learners.

 Twenty first century demands quality education and more accountability from teachers. A good teacher should look at teaching not only as a vocation but also a mission. Teachers’ have responsibilities beyond their subject specialization. They are involved in co- curricular programmes career advise, social events etc. but unfortunately now a days some of the teachers are not responsible in their profession some persons are not committed in their profession.

 A teacher must believe he or she has the capacity to exert influence on student performance. Only the students will imbibe the quality and performances of their teachers. They can influence by their teachers. Therefore the teacher must have the composite of ideas, feelings and attitudes about himself.

 Teacher Efficacy is another significant aspect of teaching. A teacher’s personality influences the children more than his teaching. His convictions, visions and activities are highly important. A good teacher has faith in himself in his subject and in his pupils.

 An effective outcome that has proven extremely important in recent years is teachers’ perceived sense of efficacy in teaching and learning situations. In general teacher efficacy refers to the teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be considered difficult or unmotivated (Guskey & Passaro ,1944) more recent investigations have shown that efficacy influences teacher’s persistence when things do not go smoothly, their resilience in the face of set backs, the enthusiasm they feel towards teaching, and their commitment to teaching (Soler *et al.,* 2001).

 In the path of educational system, it has seen that various studies have been conducted with Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy. The investigator could not find adequate number of studies which examined the effect of Teaching Styles on Teacher Efficacy. Lack of such studies in India is evident from review of related literature. This motivated the investigator to study the influence of teaching styles on Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School.

**1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy are two important aspects related to the profession of Teaching. Therefore these aspects have major role in the teaching-learning process. Moreover, these two variables are not only related to teaching but also to the learning process. Hence the study of Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy has relevance. The present study is entitled as “INFLUENCE OF TEACHING STYLE ON TEACHER EFFICACY OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS”.

1.3 **DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS**

 The definition of key terms, used in the title of the study is given in the following.

* + 1. TEACHING STYLES

Teaching Styles is a pervasive way of approaching the learners that might be consistent with several methods of teacher (Fisher & Fisher, 1979)

* + 1. TEACHER EFFICACY

Teacher Efficacy has been defined as the extent to which the teacher believes he/she has the capacity to affect student performance (Berman, *et al.,*. 1977)

* + 1. HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Higher Secondary School Teachers refers to the teachers who teach XIth and XIIth standards in government, aided and unaided schools in Kerala.

* 1. **VARIABLES OF THE STUDY**

The independent and dependent variables selected for the present study are the following

* + 1. INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

The Independent Variable selected for the study was Teaching Styles of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

* + 1. DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The Dependent Variable selected for the study was Teacher Efficacy.

* 1. **OBJECTIVES**

The following are the objectives of the study

1.5.1 To identify Teaching Style preferences of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and Sub Samples formed on the basis of Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

* + 1. To study whether there exists any significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and sub samples based on Gender, Locale and Type of Management

1.5.3 To study whether there exists any significance difference in the mean Teaching Styles Scores (Component wise and Total score) of Higher Secondary Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

1.5.4 To study whether there exists any significant difference in the Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale, and Type of Management.

**1.6 HYPOTHESES**

 The following are the hypotheses of the study.

* + 1. There exists significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise ad Total score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total Sample and Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale, Type of Management.
		2. There exists significant difference in the Mean of Teaching Styles scores (Component wise and Total score) of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

1.6.3 There exists significant difference in the Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

* 1. **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology adopted for the present study is outlined in the following sections.

* + 1. SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY

The present study was conducted on a representative sample of 300 Higher Secondary School Teachers belonging to three districts of Kerala i.e., Malappuram, Kozhikode and Palakkad. The sample was drawn using stratified Random Sampling Technique giving due representation to different strata ie, Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

* + 1. TOOLS FOR THE STUDY

The following tools were used for the study

* + - 1. ***Scale of Teaching Styles (Hameed & Manjusha, 2008)***

The scale was prepared and standardized by Hameed and Manjusha (2008). This scale was developed by giving weightage to five forms of Teaching Styles developed by Grasha (1994) ie., Formal Authority, Demonstrator or Personal model, Facilitator, Expert and Delegator. It is made in the form of a five point scale.

* + - 1. ***Teacher Efficacy Scale (Musthafa & Abidali, 2008)***

This scale was prepared and standarlized by Musthafa and Abidali (2008). This scale was developed giving due weightage to seven components of Teacher Efficacy ie., a sense of personal accomplishment, Positive expectation, Personal responsibility, Achieving objectives, Positive effect Self control and Sense of student goal.

* + 1. STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED FOR ANALYSIS

The following statistical techniques were used in the study for the analysis of the data.

1.7.3.1 Mean Difference Analysis

1.7.3.2 Pearson’s Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation

1.7.3.3 Test of Significance of ‘r’

1.7.3.4 Verbal Interpretation of ‘r’

**1.8** **SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

 The present study is an attempt to find out the Influence of Teaching Styles on Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers. The study was conducted on a sample of 300 Higher Secondary School Teachers belonging to three districts in Kerala ie, Kozhikode, Malappuram and Palakkad.

 The sample was selected using Stratified Random Sampling Technique by giving proper representation to Gender, Locale and Type of Management of Higher Secondary School Teachers. Appropriate and standardized tools were used for collecting the data from the sample. The investigator by this study, hopes that the findings of the study will help the teachers to be aware of the various Teaching Styles which they usually make use of and to reform the existing classroom situation. It is expected that this study would help to reach at valid generalisations and assumptions. Even though much precautions were taken to make the study as objective as possible, the following limitations had crept into the study.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

* + 1. The limited time and inconveniences forced the investigator to restrict the sample of three districts of Kerala ie, Kozhikode, Malappuram and Palakkad only.
		2. The sample was selected from the stage of Higher Secondary school only.
		3. The Teaching Styles and the Teacher Efficacy is studied from teacher’s point of view only. No importance was given to the opinion of students.
		4. Due to practical reasons, the study is limited to a representative sample of 300 Higher Secondary School Teachers.
	1. **ORGANISATION OF THE REPORT**

The report has been represented in five chapters

**Chapter I INTRODUCTION**

* 1. Need and Significance of the Study
	2. Statement of the Problem
	3. Definition of Key Terms
	4. Variables of the Study
	5. Objectives
	6. Hypotheses
	7. Methodology
	8. Scope and Limitations of the Study
	9. Organisation of the Report

**Chapter II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

* 1. Theoretical Frame Work of the Variables
		1. Teaching Styles
		2. Teacher Efficacy

2.2 Review of Related Studies

2.2.1 Studies Showing the Relationship Between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy

**Chapter III METHODOLOGY**

* 1. Variables of the Study
	2. Objectives
	3. Hypotheses
	4. Procedure

**Chapter IV ANALYSIS**

* 1. Preliminary Analysis
		1. Important Statistical Constants
		2. Estimation of Teaching Style Preferences
	2. Major Analysis
		1. Correlation
		2. Mean Difference Analysis

**Chapter V SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS**

* 1. Study in Retrospect
	2. Major Findings of the Study
	3. Tenability of Hypotheses
	4. Educational Implications of the Study
	5. Suggestions for Further Research.

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

The present study is an investigation into the influence of Teaching Styles on Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers in three districts of Kerala i.e., Kozhikode, Malappuram and Palakkad. For this purpose, the investigator tried his level best to review almost all the available literature in this area up to the year 2008. The reviewed literature has been classified and presented under the following headings.

**2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE VARIABLES**

2.1.1 TEACHING STYLES

2.1.2 TEACHER EFFICACY

**2.2 REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES**

2.2.1 STUDIES SHOWING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING STYLE AND TEACHER EFFICACY.

 2.1 **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE VARIABLES**

This section contains the important theoretical viewpoints of the variables Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy.

2.1.1 TEACHING STYLES

The investigator has presented a detailed theoretical outline of the variable Teaching styles in this part.

**2.1.1.1** **Definition of Teaching Styles**

Schneider thinks that Teaching Styles refers to the teaching strategies and methods employed to use of certain kinds of rhetorics. But often, the literature only focuses on one of these dimensions.

The term itself has no agreed definition but the more widely accepted definition refers to it as “a set of teaching tactics.”(Galton *et al,* 1980) “Instructional format” (Siedentop, 1991). Davis (2003) defines Teaching Styles as “the trained eye to see what is actually happening and the trained mind to decide what to do next”

**2.1.1.2 Typologies of Teaching Style**

Researchers and writers tended to describe Teaching Styles relevant to their field of study. These Teaching Styles are categorized in various approaches.

Anderson (1939) distinguished between two styles of teaching on the basis of leadership style of teacher. They are,

**Integrative Teaching Style**: In which the teacher makes allowance in his behaviour for individual differences in his pupil.

**Dominative Teaching Style**: In which individual differences are stifled and in which the teacher strives to make his students behave according to his own standards and purposes.

Moston and Ashworth (1986) defines according to Doherty (2003), a list of teaching styles. They are,

1. **Command**- Teacher makes all decisions.

2. **Practice** - Students carry out teacher – prescribed tasks.

3. **Reciprocal**- Students working pairs: one performs, the other provides feed back

4. **Self check**- Students assess their own performance against criteria.

5. **Inclusion**- Teacher planned student monitors own work.

6. **Guided discovery** – Students solve teacher set movement problems with assistance.

7. **Divergent**- Students solve problems with out assistance from the teacher.

8. **Individual** – Teacher determines content- Students plans the programme.

9. **Learner initiated**- Student plans own programme. Teacher is advisor.

10. **Self Teaching**- Student takes full responsibility for the learning process.

Grasha (1994) identified five potential approaches for class room teachers.

**1. Formal Authority**

Instructor oriented teacher works best with students who may become easily frustrated when facing new challenges and not directly addressed in the class room or students who may compete with peers for rewards and recognition. Traditional lectures are the example for this style.

**2. Demonstrator or Personal Model**

Work best with students who need little direction from the instructor or those who accept responsibility for their own learning. This type teacher’s emphasis will be on independent learning activities for groups and individuals.

**3. Facilitator**

Learner centered works best with students who accept responsibility for their own learning, enjoy working with their peers or those who may become easily frustrated when facing new challenges not directly addressed in the class room. Role modelling and coaching or guide students on developing and applying skills and knowledge are examples.

**4. Expert**

It is concerned with transmitting information and ensuring that students are well prepared. It helps to promote their competencies, information, knowledge and skills.

**5. Delegator**

Relations oriented works best with students who engaged working with their peers needing little direction from the instructor. Collaborative such as group work, peer review and other student centered learning processes consistently emphasis in a course. Teachers provide situations to the students to do activities according their interest.

Thomas (2005) describe four fundamental teaching styles

1. **Authoritarian**
2. **Permissive**
3. **Detached**
4. **Authoritative**

Horenstein (2006) and many other studies distinguish between **Teacher Centered and Student Centered Style of Teaching.**

Badler and Grinder(2006) list out four types of teaching styles.

1. **Kinesthetic style**
2. **Auditory style**
3. **Visual style**

**2.1.1.3 Teaching Style: A Theoretical Perspective**

Various theories have been formulated based on Teaching Styles. The theories provide different views regarding Teaching Styles. Some of these theories are discussed below.

1. **Behavioural Theory**

Behavioural theory emphasizes the S-R connection in learning. That is the role of external stimuli in influencing learning. Thus manipulation of external rewards and incentives make changes among the learners. Hence teachers use external rewards and incentives in order to guide the students. More over these incentives can satisfy the objectives of learning.

1. **Humanistic Theory**

Humanistic theory does not give importance to only cognitive processes. Instead, it emphasizes the development of whole person by integrating the cognitive and affective aspects of the learning experiences. The theory sees students as active learners with a natural tendency towards self- actualization. Hence, the role of a teacher is to help them how to learn. Therefore, the teachers must try to recognize the strength and weakness of the learners and help them in the process of self actualization.

1. **Cognitive Theory**

The cognitive theory gives more importance to cognition. It deals with the various cognitive processes involved in teaching. In cognitive theory emphasis is laid on how sensory input is transformed, reduced, elaborated, stored, recorded and used to solve problems. Once a problem is confronted and trying to find a solution or making a decision is acknowledged, conscious and automatic thought and action sequences are activated. It helps us to deal with familiar situations by using various automatic control processes, schemas and other mental mechanisms. Hence in the teaching learning process tasks, that provide variety and novelty will capture students attention better but care must be taken not to overload the cognitive system with too much information.

1. **Facilitative Theory of Learning**

The theory is concerned with the child centered education system. The theory states that better learning will takes place where the teacher plays the role as facilitator. Therefore the teachers should arrange all the necessary facilities for learning.

1. **Gestalt Theory of Learning**

The development of insight has prime importance in the gestalt theory of learning. It also emphasizes the significance of experiences meaning and problem- solving. The role of teacher is very significant in creating insights among the learners. The method of questioning is helpful in developing insights into the academic material. So that learners can understand rather than simply memorise the material.

1. **Self-determination Theory**

This theory examined the effect of autonomy supportive, well structured and interpersonally involving teaching styles as exercise class participant’s psychological need satisfaction, motivational regulation, exercise behaviour, behavioural intention and effect.

1. **Theory of Mental Self-government**

Theory of mental self-government deals with the mental activities involved in the regulation of behaviour. Sternberg (1994) defines it as a preferred way of expressing or using one or more abilities.

**2.1.1.4 Approaches to Identify the Elements of Styles**

Students learn in many ways as well as teaching methods vary. Teachers will probably be able to identify different ‘styles’ or approaches probably the learners could categorized them with one word. Most teachers do not even think about how they appear to students. For Grasha (1994) there are a number of factors that influence the teaching. The teachers’ response to student learning styles, the students capabilities to handle course demands, their need for teacher directly control classroom tasks, Dand their willingness to build or maintain relationships are important elements in determining what teaching styles will be adopted in a classroom. Different therists have stated different approaches to identify the elements of styles. Eight possibilities are offered by Grasha, They are,

1. **General patterns of class room Behaviour**

The style represents those personal dispositions people publicly display is given as general modes.

1. **Characteristics Associated with a popular instructor**

These instructors have characteristics that colleagues and students judge to be unique and interesting.

1. **Teaching methods employed**

The preferred individual practices of teachers describe their style. Thus a person must be labeled a lecture, discussion leader, or perhaps a Socratic teacher. Here a style become synonymous with the methods employed in the class room.

1. **Behavior common to all college faculties.**

These are identified largely through to research on the characteristics associated with effective teaching.

1. **The roles teachers play**

Roles are consistent patterns of behavior that guide and direct out thoughts and behaviors in specific situations.

1. **Personality traits**

Charecteristics found in formal theory of personality are used to describe the styles of college teachers.

1. **Archetypal forms**

Basic yet pervasive forms or models of teaching are identifies. To varying degrees, all teachers are assumed to be representations of copies of these basic forms.

1. **Metaphors of Teaching**

Analogies, similes, allegories and other forms of figurative language are employed to describe the behaviours of the teachers.

**2.1.1.5 Measurement of Teaching Styles**

Teaching Styles are those styles used or adopted by teachers for teaching. A few instruments were developed to measure Teaching Styles. Some survey tools for describing Teaching Styles are given below.

The Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) by Conti (1983)was developed for measuring congruency between adult education practitioners’. Actual observable class room behavior and their expressed belief in the collaborative teaching-learning mode.

Dollmans(2003) developed an instrument based on Socio-constructivist believes about small group teaching and is composed of i) active or constructive learning ii) Self directed learning iii) Contextual learning iv) collaborative learning v) Teacher’s interpersonal behavior.

Grasha (1994) developed a Teaching Styles Inventory in (1997) with five components including Expert, Delegator, Facilitator, Formal Authority and Personal Model. Canfield (1977) developed an Instructional Style Inventory.

Teaching Behavior Preferences Survey (TBPS) developed by Horenstein (2006) measure Teaching Styles’ belief across two domains : Teacher-Centered (TC) and Student- Centered (SC), and four sub domains: Methods of instruction(MI), Class room milieu(CM),use of questioning(UQ) and use of assessment(UA).Recently a Scale of Teaching Style (STS) was developed by Hameed& Manjusha(2008) based on the components of the inventory developed by Grasha (1994). Detailed description of SES is produced in Chapter III

* + 1. TEACHER EFFICACY

The theoretical framework of the variable of Teacher Efficacy is given in the following sections.

* + - 1. **Defining the concept**

“Teacher Efficacy is defined as the extent which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (Berman, *et al,* 1997)

Teacher Efficacy enhances human accomplishments and personal well being in many ways, people with high assurance in their capabilities approach different task as challenges to be measured rather than as threats to be avoided.

* + - 1. **Teacher Efficacy: A Conceptual Overview**

The theoretical foundation of self-efficacy is found in social cognitive theory, developed by former A.P.A President (1974) and current stanford professor Albert Bandura (1977, 1997). Central to Bandura’s (1997) frame work is his concept of self-efficacy. Bandura’s aspirations about self-efficacy were grand, as reflected in the title of his 1977 article “Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioural Change”. In this work, Bandura defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments.”

Consistent with the general formulation of self-efficacy, Tsehannen-Moran and Hoy defined Teacher Efficacy as a teacher’s “Judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated.” The study of Teacher Efficacy is a little over quarter century ago and began with RAND researchers evaluation of whether teachers believed they could control the reinforcement of their actions (Armor et al., 1976). Historically, the Bandura (1977) and Rotter (1966) traditions have influenced the study of Teacher Efficacy.

* + - 1. **Teacher Efficacy: A factor Affecting Instruction**

Teacher Efficacy is one of the important factor affecting instruction and as a result it is an essential variable related to a teacher. Teachers with high efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, seek improved teaching methods, and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). Coladarci (1992) observed higher professional commitment for efficacious in-service teachers. Efficious teacher willing to accept the risk of negative feedback from a coach (Ross, 1992). More likely to see coaching as an opportunity to exposed and consolidate their teaching techniques. It is proven to be as important variable in Teacher Effectiveness.

* + - 1. **Teacher Efficacy: A Factor Affecting Student Achievement**

Several studies have established that teachers with a strong sense of efficacy tend to exhibit greater levels of planning, organization and enthusiasm. They persist when things do not go smoothly and are more resistant in the face of set backs. They had to be less critical with students who make errors and work longer with a student who is struggling (Moran & Woolfolk, 2001)

Researchers have expectedly related Teacher Efficacy to a variety of positive teaching behaviours and students out comes (Moran, Hoy &Hoy, 1998). Teacher Efficacy is strongly related to attainment (Ashton & Webb, 1986, Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross; 1992).

Soodak and Podell (1996) suggested that there may be a developmental sequence in relation to Teacher Efficacy in that prospective teacher beliefs about their future field of operation are important until they have actually had the experience to develop their self-efficacy from their personal experiences.

* + - 1. **Measurement of Teacher Efficacy**

Theory and research pertaining to Teacher Efficacy has led to the development of tools and techniques for the measurement of Teacher Efficacy. As noted, social cognitive theory provides the theoretical foundation for Teacher Efficacy. At the birth of Teacher Efficacy, RAND researchers (Armor *et al,* 1976) developed two items that were based on the locus of control orientation. Gibson and Dembo (1984) developed Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) for the assessment of Teacher Efficacy. Another Teacher Efficacy scale was developed by Hoy and Woolfolk (1990). Moran and Hoy (2001) developed Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). Recently, a new Scale of Teacher Efficacy (Teacher Efficacy Scale) was developed by Musthafa and Abidali (2008) based on 8 components developed by Bandura (1977), ie., a sense of personal Accomplishment, Positive Expectation for Student Behaviour, Personal Responsibility for student, strategies for Achieving objectives, positive Affect, sense of control, sense of common and Democratic Decision Making.

* + - 1. **Relationship between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy**

Educators have come to realize that in fact there is no single best method of teaching. Every Technique has its advantages and disadvantages and will be differentially effective depending on many factors including the topic being addressed, the students being taught and the teacher doing the teaching.

 Teacher selects their Teaching Styles and implements techniques on the basis of their beliefs and values regarding the methods and can be modified to fit within the unique belief system of the teachers. The manner in which any method, whether lecture or game, discovery based learning or discussion, is used within a learning event is the choice of the teacher and should be a refection of his or her philosophy (Heinslich & Norland, 2002) Thus before teachers can attempt to develop more feasible Teaching Styles, they must be receptive to the idea of change, beginning with a change in their beliefs about students role in the learning environment.

Fraenkal (1995) recruits that the effective teachers use small group activities to assist their students in grasping the main concept of the lesson and gain a deeper understanding of the subject**.**

**2.2 REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES**

This section presents a comprehensive analysis of the review of related studies pertaining to independent and dependent variables of the study. The survey of related from 1985 to 2009 literature exposed a number of studies related to the influence of Teaching styles on Teacher Efficacy. Results of the studies are produced I the following sections.

* + 1. **Studies showing the relationship between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy**

The related studies showing the relationship between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy are given below.

Dembo & Gibson (1985) studied Teacher’s sense of Efficacy as an important factor in School improvement. *The study revealed that the following major variables are considered in terms of development and enhancement of teacher efficacy teacher education and socialization, personal teacher variables, school organization and parent teachers’ relations.*

Hans (1986) conducted a study on relationship among Teaching styles, learning gains and Teacher Effectiveness of teachers. *The study revealed that Teachers teaching through an indirect teaching style were able to develop greater learning gains among their pupils than teachers teaching through a direct Teaching style. In indirect teaching style teachers were perceived by their students to be more effective in teaching than the direct teaching style teachers.*

Cano *et al,* (1992) studied learning styles, teaching styles and personality styles of pre-service teacher of agricultural education sample of 25 pre-service agriculture teachers, from this 11 were field dependent, 14 fields independent. *Study reveals that females tended to be more field independent, they preferred learner-centered approach to teaching*.

Richard & Eunice (1995) studied learning and Teaching styles in Foreign and second Language Education. *This study defines several dimensions of learning style thought to be particularly relevant to foreign and second language education.*

Collin (2000) investigated the relationship between instructor Teaching styles and predictor variables. *The result revealed a significant relationship between Teaching style and predictor variables*.

Smith, *et al,* (2000) studied the effects of gender and years of teaching experience on explanatory style of secondary vocational teachers. *The study revealed that both male and female had predominantly optimistic explanatory styles. Teachers with 11-20 years of experience were more optimistic over all and regarding negative events than were those who had taught for over 20 years.*

Searson & Dunn (2001) investigated the learning style-Teaching model. *The study shows that when students were taught tactually and kinesthetically rather than traditionally when taught science; they had a significantly high recall.*

Robinson *et al,* (2002) conducted the study home schooling and Teaching styles: Comparing the motivating styles of home school and public school teachers. *Results showed that religiously motivated home educators embraced a relatively more controlling style than did public school teachers.*

Nagarju & Reddy (2003) investigated the effectiveness of different style of teaching. *The result revealed that indirect teacher influence is more effective than the direct teacher influence*.

The study conducted Sandu & Anand (2003) *revealed that there is no significant difference in the experience of role diversity in the high-low teacher self-efficacy groups. Beliefs play an important role on the experience of the basic and central dimensions of burnout-emotional exhaustion. There is also a significant difference between the two groups in the feeling of personal accomplishments.*

Carol Evans (2004) conducted a study that exploring the relationship between cognitive styles and Teaching style. *In this study a statistically significant relationship was found between teaching style and age. 40% of the group claimed to teach in the same way as they had been taught themselves, even though some claimed to prefer alternative methods.*

Malow-Iroff, *et al,* (2004) investigated the study pupil control and Teacher Efficacy in a group of alternative certification teachers’ *findings from the analysis included that the inclination on the part of the Teaching follows to treat their students in a humanistic, encouraging way and feelings of competence as expressed in their personal teaching efficacy.*

Lewandowski (2005) investigated the relationship of teacher self efficacy and professional development. *The result shows that the teachers’ perceptions of self-efficacy exist in varying degrees. Teachers perceive themselves to have some degree of self efficacy and feel that their efficiencies to a degree help students to achieve.*

Van Damme (2006) conducted a study that Teacher Characteristics and Teaching style as Effective Enhancing factors of class room practice. *The study reveals that the presence of effective class room practices can be explained by a learner-centered teaching style and by good class management skills.*

Marin, *et al,* (2006) investigated the influence of different Teaching Styles on pupil’s goal orientations in physical education. *The study indicated that the teaching group denoting reproduction knowledge affected negatively pupil’s perceived motivational orientations towards learning, while other groups revealed a positive effect.*

Dehaidy (2006) investigated pre-service teachers experienced a science teaching method course designed with constructivist teaching and learning approaches. *The findings imply that impact the methods course has on self efficacy beliefs and suggest that increased personal efficacy is associated with increased student centeredness features portrayed in participants drawing*.

Wu, Su-chiao (2006) conducted a study on the Teacher Efficacy and elementary teacher education. *Findings indicated that more subject matter preparations resulted in superior efficacy.*

Kraska and Harris (2007) conducted a study that cognitive and Teaching style preferences of officers attending the air force reserve officer training instructor course. *The study revealed that no significant relationship between cognitive style and Teaching style preferences.*

The study conducted by Louange and Pojemmy (2007) was an examination of the relationship between Teaching and Learning styles and the number sense and problem solving ability of year 7 students. *This study revealed that Teaching style of the teacher could be one of the main factors responsible for the improvement of number sense and problem solving ability*.

Manuel and Casanova (2007) studied the comparative analysis of expectancies of Efficacy in in-service and prospective teachers. *The factor analysis result showed three principal factors, class room management/discipline Efficacy, personal Teacher Efficacy and General Teacher Efficacy. The result shows significant difference in Discipline Efficacy with respect to years of experience.*

Patterssrn (2008) compared general educators’ perceptions regarding the envisioned inclusion of a pupil with either dyslexia or mild mental retardation. *Study revealed that personal Teacher Efficacy was associated with teaching a pupil with mild mental retardation, while general Teacher Efficacy was associated with teaching a pupil with dyslexia. High personal Teacher Efficacy was negatively related to support from school administration.*

Manjusha.(2008) studied the influence of Teaching styles and organizational climate on Teacher Efficacy of secondary school teachers. The study revealed that Teaching style and Organisational climates have significant effect on Teacher Efficacy.

 The influence of Teacher Efficacy on the career indecision of pre-service Teachers was studied by Slone and Hancock (2008). The present study investigates, through path analytic techniques. The sample consists of 305 students’ en rolled in teacher education programs at two south eastern universities. *Results indicate the General Teacher Efficacy and Career self-efficacy has significant direct effects on career indecision. Career self-efficacy mediates significant indirect effect for both general & personal Teacher Efficacy.*

Carleton, *et al,* (2008) conducted the study an in-service teacher education programs effect on Teacher Efficacy and attitudes. *A positive correlation was observed between changes in attitude and self efficacy. Negative correlation was observed between changes in self efficacy at the beginning of the school year and changes in self efficacy at the end program*.

Bindu (2009) conducted the study analysis to the Teacher Efficacy of Teacher educators. *The study revealed the perception of teacher educators as the personal influence of teacher in the educative process is much more important than that of the external factors.*

En-chong (2009) investigated Teacher Efficacy of pre-service Teachers in Taiwan, the influence of classroom Teaching and group discussions*. The result of this study show some influences of classroom experience and group discussion on the Teacher Efficacy of this group of pre-service teachers.*

The relationship between teachers’ internet self efficacy, beliefs about web based learning and a attitudes toward web based professional development was studied by Kao and Tsai (2009). *In this study, the results supported that teachers’ internet self efficacy and beliefs about web based learning were important predictors of their attitudes toward web based professional development.*

Settlage, *et al,* (2009) Conducted a study to examine the influence of field placements settings with varying demographic profiles on pre-service teachers. *Statistical analysis of Teaching self efficacy scores revealed marginal changes over time. The findings call into question the tendency to use heightened teaching self efficacy as an indicator of individual or programmatic success.*

Shidler (2009) investigated the linkage between hours spent coaching teacher in the classroom for efficacy in content instruction and child achievement. *A significant correlation was seen in year me between time coaches spent in the classroom and students’ alphabet recognition scores. In year-two and three no significant correlation was found.*

Hively (2009) studied Interpersonal Teaching style and student impression formation. *In this study students rated the authoritative style as most positive and the authoritarian as least positive.*

**CONCLUSION**

The above review of studies given a wide perspective of present problem under investigation. Areas of Research concerned with the relationship between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers are almost covered. It may be noted that the study of the influence of Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary Teachers is a vital importance in the present educational set up of Kerala. This in itself argues for the need for a study of this kind.

**METHODOLOGY**

The main purpose of the present study was to investigate the influence of Teaching Styles on Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers.A detailed description of the methodology followed by the investigator is given under the following sub sections.

3.1 **VARIABLES OF THE STUDY**

3.2 **OBJECTIVES**

3.3 **HYPOTHESES**

3.4 **PROCEDURE**

**3.1 VARIABLES OF THE STUDY**

 The Independent and Dependent Variables selected for the present study are the following.

3.1.1 INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

The Independent variable selected for the study was Teaching Styles of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

3.1.2 DEPENDENT VARIABLE

 The dependent variable selected for the study was Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers.

* 1. **OBJECTIVES**

The following are the objectives of the study.

* + 1. To identify Teaching Style preferences of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and Sub samples formed on the basis of Gender, Locale and Type of Management.
		2. To study whether there exists any significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and Sub samples based on Gender, Locale and Type of Management
		3. To study whether there exists any significance difference in the Mean Teaching Styles Scores (Component wise and Total score ) of Higher Secondary Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.
		4. To study whether there exists any significant difference in the mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale, and Type of Management.

**3.3 HYPOTHESES**

 The following are the hypotheses of the study

* + 1. There exists significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total Sample and Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale, Type of Management.
		2. There exists significant difference in the Mean of Teaching Styles scores (Component wise and Total score) of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.
		3. There exists significant difference in the Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

**3.4 PROCEDURE**

 The procedure adopted for the present study is discussed in the following sections.

* + 1. SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY

Population meant for this study is Higher Secondary School Teachers. The size of population is finite, but very huge so the investigator has decided to take a representative sample of the population in which representativeness the extent of generalisability of the results. To meet the representativeness in sample selection, the investigator has taken decision on three major aspects namely size of the sample, techniques of sampling and factors to be represented in the sample (Gender, Locale and Type of Management.)

 The investigator decided to take a sample of 300 Higher Secondary School Teachers from Kozhikode, Malappuram and Palakkad Districts of Kerala state. The sample was collected using Stratified Random Sampling Technique. Due importance was given to Locale (Urban and Rural) Gender (Male and female) and Type of Management(Aided, Unaided and Government). Details regarding the break up of the final sample are given in Table 3.1

**TABLE 3.1**

**Break up of the Final Sample**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Locale** | **Gender** |  **Type of Management** |
| Rural | 160 | Female | 203 | Government | 111 |
| Urban | 140 | Male | 97 | Aided | 100 |
| - | - | - | - | Unaided | 89 |
| Total | 300 | Total | 300 | Total | 300 |

**3.4.2** TOOL USED FOR THE STUDY

 A description of the tools used for the present study is presented in the following sections.

3.4.2.1 **Scale of Teaching Styles-STS (Hameed & Manjusha, 2008)**

 Teaching Styles of Higher Secondary School Teachers were measured using a recently developed Scale of Teaching Style by Hameed and Manjusha (2008). It was made in the form of a five point Likert scale. This Scale was developed giving weightage to five components of Teaching Styles. (Grasha, 1994). They are the following.

1. Formal Authority
2. Demonstrator or Personal Model
3. Facilitator
4. Expert
5. Delegator

The five possible responses for each statement were **Always**, **Often**, **Sometimes**, **Rarely** and **Never**. The Scale consists of 42 items not of which 25 are positive and 17 are negative statements. Among these 42 items, 8 items are to measure the Formal Authority Style; 9 items for Demonstrator or Personal model; 10 items for Facilitator, 10 for Expert and 5 items for Delegator style.

**Validity and Reliability of the Scale**

Face validity and content validity of the Scale of Teaching styles were established by the Scale constructors. Reliability of the Scale of Teaching Styles was found by Test-Retest Method. Reliability coefficient 0.72 obtained through Co-efficient of Correlation Method. The Scale of teaching style in malayalam language and in English version are given as Appendices I and IA

* + - 1. **Teacher Efficacy Scale(Musthafa & Abidali, 2008)**
				1. To measure the Teacher Efficiency of Higher Secondary School Teachers, a recently developed Scale of Teacher Efficacy by Musthafa and Abidali (2008) was used.

This Scale was developed giving weightage to seven components of Teacher Efficacy (Gibson & Dembo,1984). They are the following

1. Sense of personal accomplishment.
2. Positive expectation for student behaviour and achievement
3. Personal responsibility of the student
4. Strategies for achieving objectives
5. Positive effect
6. Sense of control
7. Sense of common/student goal.

The five possible response for each statement were **Strongly agree**, **Agree,** **Undecided**, **Disagree** and **Strongly disagree**. The Scale consists of 45 items out of which 36 are positive and 9 are negative statements.

 Test constructors established the face validity and content validity of Teacher Efficacy Scale. By using Test-Retest Method, Reliability of the Teacher Efficacy Scale was found by the Scale constructors. Teacher Efficacy in Malayalam language and in English version is given as Appendices II and II A.

**3.4.3** DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

 For the collection of data, the investigator decided the sample size, and then selected schools for data collection from three districts of Kerala, i.e., Malappuram, Kozhikode and Palakkad. The investigator contacted the Principals of the institutions concerned and obtained their prior permission for collecting data from the Teachers. Then the investigator formally contacted the teachers and explained the purpose of the test and requested the to co-operate. The data collection tools i.e., Scale of Teaching styles, and Teacher Efficacy Scale were administered to the same teachers. All the test were administered by the investigator personally and a uniform procedure was adopted in the administration.

3.4.4 SCORING AND CONSOLIDATION OF DATA

 Scoring of the response sheets were done as per the scoring scheme of the respective tools prepared. All the response sheets, correct in all sense were scored and consolidated for final statistical analysis. All variables were coded to facilitate computer analysis.

* + 1. STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED FOR ANALYSIS

The hypotheses and hence the objectives warranted the use of the following Statistical Techniques in analyzing the data. The entire statistical processing was done through computer. The various Statistical Techniques used for analyzing data are given below.

**3.4.5.1 Mean Difference Analysis**

 For the present study Test of significance of Difference Between Mean was used to compare the relevant variables (Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy) with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management. For the Mean Difference Analysis the following formula given by Garett (1981) was used.



 Here , are the mean, are the Standard Deviation and N1, N2 sample size of the groups. The difference between means is said to be significant depending upon whether the t- values exceeds the tabled values set for 0.01 and 0.05 level of significance.

* + - 1. **Pearson’s Product Moment Co-efficient of Correlation**

Correlation is the relationship between two or more paired variables or two or more sets of data. The degree of relationship is measured and represented by the co-efficient of correlation. The most often used and most precise co efficient of correlation is known as the Pearson’s Product Moment Coefficient.

The formula for finding the co-efficient of correlation is.



Here,

 r = coefficient of correlation

N = Number of paired scores

  = sum of obtained scores of variables X

 = sum of obtained scores of variable Y

2 = sum of squares of the obtained score of variable X

 = sum of squares of the obtained score of variable Y

 =sum of the product of the obtained score of variables X and Y.

**3.4.5.3 Test of Significance of ‘r’**

 The obtained ‘r’ was tested to find whether it is significant or not by using Fisher’s t test.

T=

N = size of sample

R = the obtained coefficient of correlation

**3.4.5.4**  **Verbal Interpretation of ‘r’** (Garret-1981)

 The coefficient of correlation between two variables is described as ‘high’ ‘marked’ and ‘substantial’ or ‘negligible’ depending upon the numerical index of ‘r’

r from 0.00 to + 0.20 denote in difficult or negligible relationship

r from + 0.20 to + 0.40 denote low correlation but slight

r from= + 0.40 to + 0.70 denote substantial or marked relationship

r from + 0.70 to + 1.00 denote high to very high relationship.

**ANALYSIS**

The main purpose of the present study was to find out the influence of Teaching Styles on Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers. The collected and tabulated data were analysed using the statistical techniques, like Mean Difference Analysis and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. A part from that the statistical Analysis of the consolidated data has been done on the basis of the objectives set for the study.

Analysis of the data has been done classified and presented in the following order.

* 1. **PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS**

4.1.1 IMPORTANT STATISTICAL CONSTANTS

4.1.2 ESTIMATION OF TEACHING STYLE PREFERENCE

**4.2. MAJOR ANALYSIS**

* + 1. CORRELATION
		2. MEAN DIFFERENCE ANALYSIS

**4.1 PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS**

 The statistical constants were computed to find the nature of distribution. apart from that the Teaching Style Preferences of Higher Secondary School Teachers are examined as presented in the following sections.

4.1.1 IMPORTANT STATISTICAL CONSTANTS

 As a first step of analysis, the investigator has done preliminary analysis. For this, important statistical constant such as mean, median, mode, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis were computed for the Total sample and sub samples are presented in Table 4.1. and Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.1

**Statistical Constants of The Variable Teaching Styles**

**(component wise and Total score)for the Total sample**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample**  | **Statistical Constants**  | **Formal** **Authority** | **Demonstration** | **Facilitator** | **Expert** | **Delegator**  | **Total**  |
| Total**(N= 300)** | Mean | 26.795 | 35.37 | 41.02 | 33.24 | 18.51 | 154.9 |
| Median | 27 | 36 | 42 | 34 | 19 | 158 |
| Mode | 27.41 | 37.26 | 43.96 | 35.52 | 19.97 | 164.13 |
| SD | 2.74 | 5.28 | 6.55 | 4.24 | 3.25 | 14.28 |
| Skewness | 0.349 | -0.97 | -0.92 | -0.35 | -0.32 | -0.71 |
| Kurtosis  | 0.458 | 1.06 | -0.058 | -0.12 | -0.704 | -0.005 |

Obtained statistical constants such as Mean, Median and Mode are approximately equal. There fore the distribution shows that the variables follow approximately normal distribution.

TABLE 4.2

**Statistical Constant of the Variable**

 **Teacher Efficacy for the Total sample and Sub Samples**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Samples** | **Mean** | **Median** | **Mode** | **SD** | **Skewness** | **Kurtosis**  |
|  | **Total** | 183.09 | 182 | 179.83 | 17.16 | -0.11 | 0301 |
| **gender**  | **Male** | 183.79 | 183 | 181.41 | 19.76 | 0.16 | -0.79 |
| **Female** | 182.75 | 182 | 180.49 | 15.83 | -0.38 | 1.19 |
| **Locale** | **Rural** | 181.62 | 183 | 185.76 | 15.95 | -0.47 | 1.51 |
| **Urban** | 184.73 | 182 | 176.54 | 18.33 | 0.087 | -0.68 |
| **Type of management**  | **Aided** | 184.26 | 184 | 183.48 | 17.63 | 0.24 | -0.395 |
| **Govt.** | 185.42 | 185 | 184.16 | 17.15 | -0.11 | -0.55 |
| **Unaided** | 178.77 | 179 | 179.44 | 15.97 | -0.798 | 2.308 |

 The three measure of central tendency Mean, Median and Mode of the variables are approximately equal. Hence the distributions follow near normality.

**4.1.2 Teaching Style Preferences of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and Sub samples formed on the basis of Gender Locale and Type of Management.**

 Teaching Style preference for the Total sample and sub samples formed on the basis of gender, Locale and Type of Management are presented in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3

**The Data Showing the Teaching**

 **Style Preference for the Total sample and Sub Samples**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sample**  | **Teaching Styles** |
| **Formal authority** | **Demonstrator** | **Facilitator** | **Expert** | **Delegator** |
| **Total** | 13 | 65 | 170 | 6 | 62 |
| Gender | **Male** | 4 | 28 | 40 | 2 | 28 |
| **Female** | 9 | 37 | 130 | 4 | 34 |
| locale  | **Rural** | 7 | 38 | 82 | 3 | 31 |
| **Urban** | 6 | 27 | 88 | 3 | 31 |
| Type of management  | **Govt.** | 2 | 22 | 69 | 1 | 32 |
| **Aided** | 6 | 21 | 45 | 2 | 25 |
| **Unaided** | 5 | 22 | 56 | 3 | 5 |

The Table 4.3 shows that the Total sample gives most preference to the Facilitator Style of teaching and least preference for Expert Style of Teaching.

 Sub samples based on gender (Male and Female) also gives most preference to the Facilitator Style of Teaching and least preference to Expert Style of Teaching.

 Rural and Urban Teachers gives move preference to Facilitator Style of Teaching. They gives less preference to Expert Style of Teaching.

 Sub samples based on Type of Management (Aided, Unaided, and Government Higher Secondary School Teachers) also have shown more preference to Facilitator Style of Teaching where as. Expert Style of Teaching was given least preference.

In conclusion, the Teaching StylePreferences of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and sub samples based on Gender, Locale, Type of managementshows that Higher Secondary School Teachers of Kerala (Total sample and Sub sample )have more preference for Facilitator Style of Teaching and least preferences for Expert Style of Teaching

**4.2 MAJOR ANALYSIS**

 In this section of the chapter, the data were analysed to study the correlation between Teacher Style and Teacher Efficacy employing the Statistical Technique Pearson's coefficient of correlation. This section also contains the Mean Difference Analysis of the Variables Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub samples based on Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

* + 1. INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING STYLES (COMPONENT WISE AND TOTAL SCORE) AND TEACHER EFFICACY OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

This part of analysis was directed to examine the extent and nature of relationship between dependent and independent variable. The correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy was computed for the Total sample and the relevant sub samples formed on the basis of Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

 The method used to calculated the coefficient of correlation was Pearson's product moment co-efficient of correlation 'r' The obtained correlation co-efficient 'r' and the significance of 'r' both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance were worked out and presented in the following sections.

**4.2.1.1 Relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise Total Score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Total Sample.**

The correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for the Total sample was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Total sample together with significance of 'r' both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance are summarised in Table 4.4

TABLE 4.4

**Data and Result Showing the relationship between**

 **Teachings Styles and Teacher Efficacy for the Total Sample**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | 'r' | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of****significance** |
| **Teaching styles**  | **Formal authority** | 0.104 | 1.81 | NS |
| **Demonstrator** | 0155 | 2.72 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.233 | 4.16 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.199 | 3.52 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.25 | 4.48 | 0.01 |
| **Total**  | 0.299 | 5.45 | 0.01 |

NS = Not significance

The Table 4.4 shows that the coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.104. It implies a negligible positive relationship Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy. Further the critical ratio obtained is 1.81 which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level (1.96). As such it implies that the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level.

It can be seen from the Table 4.4, that the value of co-efficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.155. It indicates a negligible positive Relationship between Demonstrator Style and Teacher Efficacy. The result obtained for the test of significance is 2.72,which is greater that the limit set for significance at 0.01 level (2.58). It implies that, the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

The Table also reveals that the co efficient of correlation between Facilitator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.233,which indicates a low positive relationship. The result obtained for the test of significance is 4.16 it implies that the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

The value of coefficient of correlation between Expert Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.199,which implies a negligible positive relationship. The critical ratio obtained is 3.52,which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Hence the correlation is found significant at 0.01 level.

It can be noted from the Table 4.4 that the coefficient of correlation between Delegator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.25, which implies that relationship is low positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 4.48 which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level (2.58). Hence the correlation is found to be significant at 0.01 level.

It can also be seen that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Style (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy is found to be 0.299,which indicates a low positive relationship. The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 5.45 which is greater the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. There fore it implies a significant correlation between the Teaching Style (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy.

* + - 1. **Relationship Between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for the Male Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Total male Teacher was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Male Teachers together with significance of 'r' both at 0.05 level and 0.01 level of significance are summarised in Table 4.5

TABLE 4.5

**Data and results showing Relationship between Teaching**

 **Styles and Teacher Efficacy of Male and Higher Secondary Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | 'r' | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of significances** |
| **Teaching style s** | **Formal authority** | 0.169 | 1.67 | NS |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.139 | 1.36 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.267 | 2.7 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.338 | 3.5 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.303 | 3.10 | 0.01 |
| **Total**  | 0.425 | 4.57 | 0.01 |

 NS= Not significance

Table 4.5 shows that the coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.169. It implies a negligible positive relationship. Further the critical ratio obtained is 1.67 which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level (ie, 1.96). There fore the relationship is not significant at 0.05 level.

Table also shows that the coefficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.139. It indicates a negligible positive relationship. The result obtained for the test of significance is 1.36, which is less that the limit value of 0.05 level (1.96). Then it indicates that the correlation is not significant at both 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance.

 It can be seen from the Table 4.5 that the coefficient of correlation between Facilitator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.267. This value indicates that the relationship is low. The Critical ratio obtained is .338,which is greater than the limit value of 0.01 level of significance. Therefore the correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

 The coefficient of correlation between Expert Style and Teacher Efficacy is 2.7,which indicates that the relationship is a positive low correlation. The critical ratio for the test significance is 3.5,which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Thus we can say that the relationship is significant at 0.01 level.

 From the Table 4.5, the coefficient of correlation between the Detegator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.303. This value reveals that the correlation is low and positive. The critical ratio for the list of significance is 3.10, which is greater than the limit value for the test of significance at 0.01 level (2.58) Thus the relationship is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

 It can also be seen that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Male is 0.425, which indicates a positive marked relationship. The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 4.57,which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. There fore it implies a significant correlation between the Teaching Style (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for Male Higher Secondary School teachers.

**4.2.1.3** **Relationship between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Female Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Female Teachers was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the female together with significance of 'r' both at 0.05 level and 0.01 level of significance are summarised in Table 4.6

TABLE 4.6

**Data and Results**

 **Showing Relationship Between Teaching Styles and**

 **Teacher Efficacy for Female Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'r'** | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of significances** |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal authority** | 0.064 | 0.916 | NS |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.167 | 2.42 | 0.05 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.225 | 3.30 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.115 | 1.65 | NS |
| **Delegator** | 0.213 | 3.11 | 0.01 |
| **Total**  | 0.247 | 3.64 | 0.01 |

NS = Not Significant

From Table 4.6, the coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.064, which implies a negligible relationship. Further the critical ratio obtained is 0.916, which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level (ie, 1.96). Thus the relationship between Formal Authority and Teacher Efficacy not significant even at 0.05 levels.

 It can be noted that the coefficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.167. This value indicates that the relationship is negligible and positive . The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 2.42,. This value is greater than the limit value for the test of significance at 0.05 level but the value is less than the limit value for the test of significance at 0.01 level. Hence the relationship is significant at 0.05 level and not significant at 0.01 level of significance.

 The coefficient of correlation between Facilitator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.225, which indicate the relationship is low and positive. The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 3.3, which is greater than the critical limit for the test of significance at 0.01 level. So the relationship is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

 It can be seen that the coefficient of correlation between the Expert Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.115, which reveals that the relationship is negligible and positive. Further the critical ratio obtained is 1.65 Which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level (1.96). There fore the relationship is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4.6 shows that the coefficient and correlation between Delegator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.213, which indicates that the relationship is low and positive. The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 3.11, which is greater than the limit value of 0.01 level significance. Hence the relationship is significant at 0.01 level.

 The Table also reveals that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Female Higher Secondary School Teachers is 0.247. This value indicates a positive low correlation. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is 3.64. This value is greater than the limit value for the significant correlation between the Teaching Style (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for Female Higher Secondary School Teachers.

**4.2.1.4** **Relationship Between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Rural Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy for Rural Teachers was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Rural Teachers together with significance of 'r' both at 0.05 level and 0.01 level of significance are summarised in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7

**Data and Results Showing**

**Relationship Between Teaching Style and**

 **Teaching Efficacy for Rural Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'r'** | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of****Significances** |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal authority** | 0.175 | 2.23 | 0.05 |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.209 | 2.68 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.262 | 3.41 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.036 | 0.46 | NS |
| **Delegator** | 0.089 | 1.12 | NS |
| **Total**  | 0.267 | 3.49 | 0.01 |

NS: Not Significant

 Table 4.7 shows that the coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.175 which indicates that relationship is negligible and positive. The critical value obtained is 2.23. This value is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level (1.96) but which is less than the limit value for significance at 0.01 level (2.58). Hence the correlation is significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be seen from the Table 4.7 that the value of coefficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.209, which implies a low and positive relationship. Further the critical ratio obtained is 2.68 which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level (2.58). It implies that the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 The Table also reveals that the coefficient of correlation between Facilitator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.262. This value indicate that the relationship is low and positive. The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 3.41, Which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Thus the correlation is significance at 0.01 level. Thus the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 The coefficient of correlation between Expert Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.036, which indicates a positive and negligible correlation between Expert Style and Teacher Efficacy. The critical ratio obtained is 0.46, which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. It indicate that the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level of significance.

 It can be noted from Table 4.7 that the coefficient of correlation between Delegator Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.089 which indicates a positive negligible relationship. The critical value obtained is 1.12, which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence the relationship is not significant at 0.05 level.

 The Table also reveals that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Rural Teachers is 0.267. This value indicates a positive low correlation. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is 3.49. This value is greater than the limit value for the significance at 0.01 level There for the relati8onship is significant.

**4.2.1.5 Relationship between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for the sub sample Urban Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy for Urban Teachers was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Urban Teachers together with significance of 'r' both at 0.05 level and 0.01 level of significance are summerised in Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.8

**Data and Result Showing**

**Relationship Between Teaching Styles**

**and Teacher Efficacy for Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'r'** | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of significances** |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal authority** | 0.036 | 0.43 | NS |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.091 | 1.08 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.206 | 2.50 | 0.05 |
| **Expert** | 0.323 | 4.04 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.396 | 5.12 | 0.01 |
| **Total**  | 0.327 | 4.11 | 0.01 |

NS: Not Significant

 Table 4.8 shows that the coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.036, which implies a negligible and positive relationship between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy. The result obtained for test of significance of 'r' is 0.43. This critical ratio is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence it implies that the correlation is not significant even at 0.05 level.

 The coefficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.091, which implies a negligible positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 1.08,which is less than the limit set for see significance at 0.05 level. There fore it implies that the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level.

 The value of coefficient of correlation between Facilitator Style of teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.206 which implies a low positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 2.5,which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. The implication is that the correlation is significant at 0.05 level.

 It can also be noted from Table 4.8 is that the coefficient of correlation between Expert Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.323 which indicates a low positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 4.04, which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Thus the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 It can be seen from the Table that the coefficient of correlation between Detegator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.396. This value indicates the relationship is Low and positive. The critical ratio obtained is 5.12 which is greater than the limit value at 0.01 level of significance. Then the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 It can also be evidenced from the Table that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy is 0.327, which indicates a low positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 4.11, which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Hence it implies a significant relationship between these two.

**4.2.1.6 Relationship Between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Aided Higher Secondary School**  **Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy for Total Aided Teachers was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Total Aided Teachers along with significance of coefficient of correlation both at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance are summerised in Table 4.9

TABLE 4.9

**Data and Result Showing**

**Relationship Between Teaching Styles**

**and Teacher Efficacy for Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'r'** | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of** **significances** |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal authority** | -0.004 | -0.04 | NS |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.118 | 1.18 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.11 | 1.109 | NS |
| **Expert** | 0.354 | 3.75 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.263 | 2.7 | 0.01 |
| **Total**  | 0.255 | 2.6 | 0.01 |

NS: Not Significant

The coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is -0.004, which indicates that a negligible negative positive correlation. The critical ratio is -0.041, which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level.

 From Table 4.9 it can also be noted that the Correlation of coefficient between Demonstrator Style of teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.118, which indicates a negligible positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 1.18,which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. There fore the correlation is significant at 0.05 level.

 It can also be seen from Table 4.9 is that the correlation coefficient between Facilitator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.111, which reveals that the correlation is negligible and positive. The critical value is less than the limited set for significance at 0.01 level. Thus the correlation is significant at 0.05 level. Hence the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.9 also shows that the correlation of coefficient between Expert Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.354. which indicate a positive negligible correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 3.75, which is greater than the limit set for significant at 0.01 level. Hence the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 It can be found from the Table 4.9 that the coefficient of correlation between Delegator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.263, which implies a positive relationship. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance of 'r' is 2.7 which is greater than the limit set for the significance at 0.01 level. There fore the relationship is significant at 0.01 level.

 It can also be evident from the Table 4.9 that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy is 0.255,which indicates a low positive correlation is 2.6,which is greater than the limit value for the significance at 0.01 level. Thus the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

**4.2.1.7** **Relationship Between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy for Government Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Government Higher Secondary School Teachers was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Government Higher Secondary School Teachers together with significance of 'r' summarised in Table 4.10

TABLE 4.10

**Data and Result Showing**

**Relationship between Teacher Styles**

**and Teacher Efficacy of Government Higher Secondary School**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'r'** | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of significances** |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal authority** | 0.237 | 2.58 | 0.01 |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.286 | 3.16 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.425 | 4.98 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.224 | 2.44 | 0.05 |
| **Delegator** | 0.203 | 2.198 | 0.05 |
| **Total**  | 0.459 | 5.47 | 0.01 |

NS : Not significant

Table 4.10 also shows that the coefficient of correlation between Formal Authority Style and Teacher Efficacy is 0.237, which indicates that the correlation is low and positive. This critical ratio is 2.589 which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level (2.58). There fore the correlation between the two variables is significant at 0.01 level.

 The coefficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.286, which implies a low positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 3.16, which is greater than the limit value than the limit value for the significance at 0.01 level. Hence the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 Table 4.10 also reveals that the coefficient of correlation between facilitator Style of teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.425 which implies a marked positive correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 4.98 which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. There fore the correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

 It can be seen from the Table is that the correlation coefficient between Expert Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.224,which indicates that the correlation is low and positive. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is 2.44, which is significant at 0.01 level. Hence the correlation is significant at 0.01 level of significance.

 The correlation coefficient between the Detegator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.203,which implies a positive low correlation. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is 2.198,which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Hence the correlation between these two variables is significant at 0.01 level.

 It can be found from the Table that the coefficient of correlation between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy is 0.459, which implies a positive marked correlation. The critical ratio obtained is for the test of significance is 5.47, which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.01 level. Hence the correlation between these two variables is significant at 0.01 level.

* + - 1. **Relationship Between Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy for the Unaided Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy for Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers was investigated. The details of the coefficient of correlation obtained for the Government Higher Secondary School Teachers together with significance of 'r' summarised in Table 4.11

TABLE 4.11

**Data and Result Showing**

 **Relationship Between Teaching Styles**

**and Teacher Efficacy for Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'r'** | **Critical Ratio** | **Level of significances** |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal authority** | 0.086 | 0.8 | NS |
| **Demonstrator** | 0.144 | 1.35 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.259 | 2.50 | 0.05 |
| **Expert** | 0.047 | 0.44 | NS |
| **Delegator** | 0.21 | 2.03 | 0.05 |
| **Total**  | 0.23 | 2.24 | 0.05 |

 NS: Not Significant

It can be seen from Table 4.11 that the correlation coefficient between Formal Authority Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.086 which indicate the correlation is negligible and positive. The critical ratio for the test of significance is 0.8, which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4.11 shows that the coefficient of correlation between Demonstrator Style of teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.144, which indicate a negligible positive relationship. This critical ratio for the test of significance is 1.35, which is not significant at 0.05 level.

 The correlation coefficient between the Facilitator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.259, which implies a positive low correlation. The critical ratio obtained is 2.50,which is less than the limit value at 0.01 level. But the critical value is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence the correlation is significant only at 0.05 level.

 It can also be seen from Table 4.11 the correlation coefficient between Expert Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.047, which indicates a negligible positive correlation. The critical value of the test of significance is 0.44, which is less than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence the correlation is not significant at 0.05 level.

 It can also be found that the correlation coefficient between Delegator Style of Teaching and Teacher Efficacy is 0.21, which gives the information that the correlation is low and positive. The critical ratio is 2.03,which is greater than the limit value for the test of significance at 0.05 level. There fore the correlation is significant at 0.05 level.

 From the Table It can be found that the correlation coefficient between Teaching Styles (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy is 0.23, which implies a low positive correlation. The critical ratio for the test of significance is 2.24 which is greater than the limit set for significance at 0.05 level. Hence the correlation between teaching Style (Total score) and Teacher Efficacy is significant only at 0.05 level of significance.

* + 1. **MEAN DIFFERENCE ANALYSIS**

In this part of the major analysis, the mean difference analysis for the sub samples based on Gender, Locale and Type of management for the variable teaching styles and Teacher Efficacy were attempted and presented.

**4.2.2.1 Comparison of Mean Scores of Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) between Female and Male Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**.

The mean and standard deviation of the Teaching Styles score of Male and Female Teachers were found out. They are further subjected to Test of Significance of Difference Between Means for Large Independent Samples. The data and results of the 't' test for the comparison of Teaching Style score between Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers are presented in Table 4.12.

TABLE 4.12

**Data and results of 't'**

**test Between Mean scores of Teaching**

**Styles for Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Male** | **Female** | **'t'** **value** | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  |  | M2 |  | N2 |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal** **Authority** | 27.02 | 2.73 | 97 | 26.68 | 2.73 | 203 | 0.884 | N.S |
| **Demonstrator** | 35.15 | 5.34 | 97 | 35.47 | 5.26 | 203 | -0.48 | N.S |
| **Facilitator** | 40.03 | 6.10 | 97 | 41.48 | 6.71 | 203 | -1.81 | N.S |
| **Expert** | 33.78 | 4.26 | 97 | 32.98 | 4.21 | 203 | 1.54 | N.S |
| **Delegator** | 18.83 | 3.52 | 97 | 18.36 | 3.10 | 203 | 1.17 | N.S |
| **Teaching Style** **Total** | 154.82 | 12.6 | 97 | 154.99 | 15.03 | 203 | -.094 | N.S |

NS: Not Significant

 Table 4.12 indicates that the mean score obtained for the Formal Authority Style of Teaching of Male and Female are 27.02 and 26.68 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the same are 2.73 and 2.73 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is 0.984. Since the obtained 't' value is less than the Table value, (1.96, 0.05 level of significance) the difference in Mean scores of formal Authority Style for Total Male and Female is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be noted from Table 4.12 that the Mean scores obtained in Demonstrator Style of Teaching of Male and Female are 35.15 and 35.47 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the Demonstrator Style of Teaching for Male and Female are 5.34 and 5.26 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -0.485 which is less than the Table d value for 0.05 significant level. Hence the difference in mean scores of male and female in Demonstrator Style of Teaching is not found significant even at 0.05 level.

 The Table also indicates that the mean score obtained for the Facilitator Style of Teaching of Male and Female are 40.03 and 41.48 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for Facilitator Style of Teaching are 6.1 and 6.71 respectively. The critical ratio estimated is less than the Table value, the difference in mean scores of facilitator Style is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 The Table shows that the mean score obtained for Expert Style of Teaching of Male and female are 33.78 and 32.98 respectively. The standard deviations for the same are 4.26 and 4.21 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is 1.54, which is less than Table value. Then the difference in men scores of Expert Style of teaching is not significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be seen from the Table that the Mean scores obtained for Delegator Style of Teaching of Male and Female are 18.83 and 18.36 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 3.52 and 3.1 respectively. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is 1.17. The Table value for 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Hence the difference in mean scores of Male and Female in Delegator Style of Teaching is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can also be noted from Table 4.12 that the mean obtained for Teaching Styles Total score for Male and Female are 154.82 and 154.99 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the Teaching Styles Total score for Male and Female are 12.6 and 15.03 respectively. The 't' estimated is -0.94. Since the obtained 't' value is less than TABLE value, the difference in mean score of Teaching Styles Total for Male and Female is not found significant even at 0.05 level.

**4.2.2.2 Comparison of Mean Score of Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) between Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**

The means and standard deviation of the Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) of Rural and Urban Teachers were find out. They are further subjected to the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and results of the 't' test for the comparison of Teaching Style. Score between Rural and Urban Teachers are presented in Table 4.13.

TABLE 4.13

**Data and Results**

**of 't' test Between Mean Scores of Teaching**

**Styles for Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Rural**  | **Urban** | **'t'** value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal Authority** | 26.64 | 2.50 | 160 | 26.96 | 2.97 | 140 | -1.02 | N.S |
| **Demonstrator** | 35.16 | 5.62 | 160 | 35.6 | 4.88 | 140 | -0.72 | N.S |
| **Facilitator** | 40.97 | 6.74 | 160 | 41.06 | 6.34 | 140 | -0.126 | N.S |
| **Expert** | 33.09 | 3.79 | 160 | 33.39 | 4.69 | 140 | -0.624 | N.S |
| **Delegator** | 18.45 | 3.14 | 160 | 18.58 | 3.36 | 140 | -0.33 | N.S |
| **Teaching Style Total** | 154.33 | 14.19 | 160 | 155.61 | 14.39 | 140 | -0.78 | N.S |

NS: Not Significant

 Table 4.13 indicates that the mean score obtained for the formal Authority Style of Teaching of rural and urban are 26.64 and 26.96 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the same are 2.50 and 2.97 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -1.02 Since the obtained 't' value is less than the Table value, (1.96, 0.05 level of significance) the difference in Mean scores of Formal Authority Style for Total Male and Female is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be noted from Table 4.13 that the Mean scores obtained in Demonstrator Style of Teaching of Rural and Urban are 35.16 and 35.6 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the Demonstrator Style of Teaching for Rural and Urban are 5.62 and 4.88 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -0.72 which is less than the Table d value for 0.05 significant level. Hence the difference in mean scores of male and female in Demonstrator Style of Teaching is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 The Table also indicates that the mean score obtained for the Facilitator Style of Teaching of Rural and Urban are 40.97and 41.06 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for Facilitator Style of Teaching 6.74 and 6.34 respectively. The critical ratio estimated is less than the Table value, the difference in mean scores of facilitator Style is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 Table 4.13 shows that the mean score obtained for Expert Style of Teaching of Rural and Urban are 33.09 and 33.39 respectively. The standard deviations for the same are 3.79 and 4.69 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -0.624, which is less then table value. Then the difference in men scores of Expert Style of teaching is not significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be seen from table 4.13 that the Mean scores obtained for Delegator Style of Teaching of Rural and Urban are 18.45 and 18.58 respectively. The standard deviations for the same are 3.14 and 3.36 respectively. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is -0.33. The table value for 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Hence the difference in mean scores of Rural and Urban in Delegator Style of Teaching is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can also be noted from the table 4.13 that the mean obtained for Teaching Styles Total score for Rural and Urban are 154.33 and 155.61 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the Teaching Styles Total score for Rural and Urban are 14.19 and 14.39 respectively. The't' estimated is -0.781. Since the obtained 't' value is less than table value, the difference in mean score of teach Styles Total for Male and Female is not found significant even at 0.05 level.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Score of Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) Between Government and Aided Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

The mean and standard deviation of the Teaching Styles (component wise and Total score) of Government and Aided Teachers were found out. They are further subjected to the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and results of the 't' test for the comparison of Teaching Styles score between Government and Aided Teachers are presented in Table 4.14.

TABLE 4.14

**Data and Results of 't' Test**

**Between Mean Scores of Teaching Styles**

**for Government and Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Government** | **Aided** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| Formal Authority | 26.42 | 2.92 | 111 | 26.98 | 2.54 | 100 | -1.48 | N.S |
| Demonstrator | 35.39 | 4.77 | 111 | 34.19 | 5.5 | 100 | 1.7 | N.S |
| Facilitator | 41.55 | 5.38 | 111 | 39.49 | 7.26 | 100 | 2.37 | 0.05 |
| Expert | 32.52 | 4.19 | 111 | 33.75 | 4.04 | 100 | -2.18 | 0.05 |
| Delegator | 18.95 | 3.47 | 111 | 18.92 | 3.05 | 100 | 0.061 | N.S |
| Teaching Style total | 154.82 | 13.07 | 111 | 153.33 | 14.45 | 100 | 0.794 | N.S |

N.S= Not significant

 Table 4.14 indicates that the mean score obtained for the Formal Authority Style of Teaching of Government and Aided Teachers are 26.42 and 26.98 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the same are 2.92 and 2.54 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is 1.48. The table value for 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the obtained 't' value is less than the table value, the difference in Mean scores of Formal Authority Style for Government and Aided Teachers is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be noted from the Table that the Mean scores obtained in Demonstrator Style of Teaching are 35.39 and 34.19 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the same are 4.77 and 5.5 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is 1.7 which is less than table value for 0.05 level of significance. Hence the difference in mean scores is not found significant even at 0.05 level.

 The Table shows that the mean score obtained for the Facilitator Style of Teaching of Government and Aided Teachers are 41.55 and 39.49 respectively. The standard deviation for the same is 5.38 and 7.26 respectively. The obtained critical value is 2.37. Table value for 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. The obtained t value is greater than the table value. Hence the difference in mean scores of Facilitator Style is found significant at 0.05 level.

 Table 4.14 also indicates that the mean score obtained for Expert Style of Teaching of Government and Aided Teachers are 32.52 and 33.75 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -2.18, which indicates that the difference between the mean scores Expert Style of teaching is found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be seen from the table the mean scores obtained in Detegator Style of Teaching of Government and Aided Teachers are 18.95 and 18.92 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 3.47 and 3.05 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is less than the table value for 0.05 level of significance. Hence the difference between mean scores of Deligator Style of Teaching of Government and Aided Teachers is not found significant even at 0.05 level.

 It can also be noted from Table 4.14 that the mean obtained for Teaching Styles Total score for Government and Aided Teachers are 4.82 and 153.33. The standard deviation obtained for the teaching Styles Total score for government and Aided Teachers are 13.07 and 14.45 respectively. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance is 0.794. The table value for the test of significance at 0.05 level 1.96. The 't' value is less than the TABLE value. Hence the difference in mean scores of Teaching Styles Total for Government Aided Teachers is not found significant at 0.05 level.

**4.2.2.4** **Comparison of Mean Score of Teaching Style (Component wise and Total Score) Between Government and Unaided Teachers.**

The Mean and Standard Deviation of the Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total Score) of Government and Unaided Teachers were found out. They are further subjected to the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and results of the 't' test for the comparison of Teaching Styles score between Government and Unaided Teachers are presented in Table 4.15.

TABLE 4.15

**Data and Results of 't' Test**

**Between Mean Scores of Teaching Styles**

**for Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Government** | **Unaided** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| **Teaching styles** | Formal Authority | 26.42 | 2.92 | 111 | 27.07 | 2.67 | 89 | -1.62 | N.S |
| Demonstrator | 35.39 | 4.77 | 111 | 36.67 | 5.38 | 89 | -1.8 | N.S |
| Facilitator | 41.55 | 5.38 | 111 | 42.05 | 6.82 | 89 | -0.588 | N.S |
| Expert | 32.52 | 4.19 | 111 | 33.58 | 4.43 | 89 | -1.75 | N.S |
| Delegator | 18.95 | 3.47 | 111 | 17.51 | 2.95 | 89 | 3.13 | 0.01 |
| Teaching Style total | 154.82 | 13.07 | 111 | 156.88 | 15.45 | 89 | -1.03 | N.S |

NS= Not significant

 Table 4.15 indicates that the mean score obtained for the formal Authority Style of Teaching of Government and Unaided Teachers are 26.42 and 27.07 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 2.92 and 2.67 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -1.62, which indicate that the difference between mean scores of Government and Unaided Teachers in formal Authority teaching Style is found to be not significant at 0.05 level.

 Table 4.15 shows that the mean scores obtained for the Demonstrator Style of teaching of Government and Unaided Teachers are 35.38 and 36.67 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 4.77 and 5.38 respectively. The 't' value obtained is -1.80 which is less than the TABLE value for the significance at 0.05 level. Hence the difference in the mean scores of Government and Unaided Teachers in the Demonstrator Style of teaching is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be seen from table 4.15 the mean scores and standard deviation obtained in Facilitator Style of Teaching of Government and Unaided Teachers are 41.55, 42.05 and 5.38, 6.82 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -0.588, which is less than the table value. Hence the difference in the mean scores of Government and unaided Teachers in the Facilitator Style of teaching is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 Table 4.15 also indicates that the mean score obtained for Expert Style of teaching of Government and Unaided Teachers are 32.52 and 33.58 respectively and standard deviation are 4.19 and 4.43 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -1.75, which is less than Table value. Hence, the difference in mean scores of Government and unaided Teachers in the Expert Style of teaching is not found significant even at 0.05 level

 It can be seen from the Table the mean scores obtained in Delegator Style of Teaching of Government and Unaided Teachers are 18.94 and 17.51 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 3.47 and 2.95 respectively. The critical ratio 3.13 is greater than the TABLE value 2.58. Hence the difference in mean scores of Government and Unaided Teachers in Delegator Style of Teaching is found significant at 0.01 level.

 From the Table , it can also be noted that the mean and standard deviation for Teaching Styles Total score for Government and Unaided Teachers are 154.82, 156.88, 13.07 and 15.45 respectively. The critical ratio is -1.03, which is less than the Table value for the significance at 0.05 level. Hence the difference in mean scores of teaching Style Total for Government and Unaided Teachers is not found significant at 0.05 level.

**4.2.2.5 Comparison of Mean Score of Teaching Style (Component wise and Total Score ) Between Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers**

The mean and standard deviation of the Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total Score) of Aided and Unaided Teachers were found out. They are further subjected to the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and results of the 't' test for the comparison of Teaching Styles score between Aided and Unaided Teachers are presented in Table 4.16

TABLE 4.16

**Data and Results of 't' Test**

**Between Mean Scores of Teaching Styles**

**for Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Aided** | **Un aided** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| **Teaching Styles** | **Formal Authority** | 26.98 | 2.54 | 100 | 27.06 | 2.67 | 89 | -0.23 | N.S |
| **Demonstrator** | 34.19 | 5.5 | 100 | 36.67 | 5.38 | 89 | -3.12 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 39.49 | 7.26 | 100 | 42.05 | 6.81 | 89 | -2.49 | 0.05 |
| **Expert** | 33.75 | 4.04 | 100 | 33.58 | 4.43 | 89 | 0.27 | N.S |
| **Delegator** | 18.92 | 3.05 | 100 | 17.51 | 2.95 | 89 | 3.22 | 0.01 |
| **Teaching Style total** | 153.33 | 14.45 | 100 | 156.88 | 15.45 | 89 | -1.63 | N.S |

NS= Not significant

Table 4.16 indicates that the mean score obtained for the formal Authority Style of Teaching of Aided and Unaided Teachers are 26.98 and 27.06 respectively. The standard Deviation obtained for the same are 2.54 and 2.67 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -0.23. The table value for 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the obtained 't' value is less than the table value, the difference in mean scores of Formal Authority Style for Total Aided and Unaided is not found significant at 0.05 level.

 It can be noted from the Table that the mean scores obtained in Demonstrator Style of Teaching of Aided and Unaided Teachers are 34.19 and 36.67 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for the Demonstrator Style of Teaching for Aided and unaided Teachers are 5.5 and 5.38 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is -3.125 which is greater than the table value for 0.01 level of significance. Hence the difference in mean scores of Aided and Unaided Teachers in Demonstrator Style of Teaching is found significant at 0.01 level.

 Table 4.16 also indicates that the mean score obtained for the facilitator Style of teaching of Aided and Unaided Teacher are 39.49 and 42.05 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for same are 7.26 and 6.81 respectively. The 't' value estimated is 2.49, which is greater than the table value. Hence the difference in mean scores of Facilitator Style is found significant of 0.05 level.

 The Table shows that the mean score obtained for Expert Style of Teaching of Aided and Unaided Teachers are 33.75 and 33.58 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 4.04 and 4.43 respectively. The critical ratio obtained is 0.269, which is less than table value. Then the difference in mean scores of Expert Style of Teaching is not significant at 0.05 level.

 The Table shows that the mean score obtained for Delegator Style of Teaching of Aided and Unaided Teachers are 18.92 and 17.51 respectively. The standard deviation for the same are 3.05 and 2.95 respectively. The critical ratio obtained for the test of significance 3.22. The table value for 0.01 level of significance is 2.58. The 't' value is greater than the table value, there fore the difference in mean scores of Aided and Unaided Teachers in Delegator Style of Teaching is found significance at 0.01 level.

 It can be shown from the Table that the mean score obtained for the Teaching Style Total score for Aided and Unaided Teachers are 153.33 and 156.88 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for Teaching Styles Total score for Aided and Unaided Teachers are 14.45 and 15.45 respectively. The calculated 't' value is 1.63. The table value at 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the calculated't' value is less than the table score for Aided and Unaided sample were not found significant at 0.05 level.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy Between Male and Female Teachers.**

The mean and standard deviation of the dependent variable Teacher Efficacy of Male and Female Teachers were found out and subjected for the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean of Large Independent Samples. The data and results of 't' test for the Teacher Efficacy Score between Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers are presented in Table 4.17

TABLE 4.17

**Data and Result of 't'**

**Test Between Mean Score of Teacher**

 **Efficacy for Male and Female Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Male** | **Female** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| Teacher efficacy | 183.79 | 19.76 | 97 | 182.75 | 15.82 | 203 | 0.492 | N.S |

N.S= Not significant

Table 4.17 indicates that the mean scores obtained for Teacher Efficacy of Total Male and Female Teachers are 183.79 and 182.75 respectively. The standard deviation obtained for Teacher Efficacy of Male and Female are 19.76 and 15.82 respectively. The 't' value obtained is 0.492. The Table value for 0.05 level of significance is 1.96. Since the obtained 't' value is less than the table value, the mean difference in the scores of Teacher Efficacy of Male and Female Teachers is not found significant even at 0.05 level.

**4.2.2.7** **Comparison of Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy Between Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Teacher Efficacy for Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers were found out and subjected for the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and result of the 't' test for the comparison of Teacher Efficacy between Rural and Urban Teachers are presented in the Table .4.18

TABLE 4.18

**Data and Result of 't' test**

**Between Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy**

**for Urban and Rural** **Higher Secondary School**  **Teachers.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Urban** | **Rural** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| Teacher Efficacy | 184.72 | 18.3 | 111 | 181.61 | 15.95 | 160 | -1.58 | N.S |

NS= Not significant

 Table 4.18 shows that the mean scores obtained for Teacher Efficacy of Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers are 184.72 and 181.61 respectively. The corresponding standard deviation of the variable teacher Efficacy is 18.3 and 15.95 respectively. The 't' value obtained is -1.578. The table value for 0.05 significant level is 1.96, since the obtained 't' value is less than the table value the difference in the mean scores of teacher is not found significant at 0.05 level.

**4.2.2.8 Comparison of Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy Between Government and Aided Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Teacher Efficacy for Government and Aided Teachers were found out and subjected for the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and result of the 't' test for the comparison of Teacher Efficacy between Government and Aided Teachers are present in the Table 4.19

TABLE 4.19

**Data and Results of 't' test**

**Between mean scores of Teacher for**

**Government and Aided** **Higher Secondary School**  **Teachers.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Government** | **Aided** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| Teacher Efficacy | 185.42 | 17.15 | 111 | 184.26 | 17.63 | 100 | 0.488 | N.S |

N.S= Not significant

 Table 4.19 shows that the mean scores obtained for Teacher Efficacy of Government and Aided Teachers are 185.42 and 184.26 respectively. The standard deviation for the variable are 17.15 and 17.63 respectively. The critical value obtained for the test of significance is 0.488. The table value for the test of significance at 0.05 level is 1.96. Since the obtained value is less than the table value, the difference in the mean scores of Teacher Efficacy is not found significance at 0.05 level.

**4.2.2.9 Comparison of Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy Between Government and Unaided** **Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Teacher Efficacy for Government and Unaided Teachers were found out and subjected for the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and result of the 't' test for the comparison of Teacher Efficacy between Government and Unaided Teachers are present in the Table 4.20

TABLE 4.20

**Data and Results of 't' test**

**Between Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy for**

**Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Government** | **Unaided** | **'t'** Value | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| Teacher Efficacy | 185.42 | 17.15 | 111 | 178.77 | 15.97 | 89 | 2.82 | 0.01 |

Table 4.20 shows that the mean scores obtained for Teacher Efficacy of Government and Unaided Higher Secondary school Teachers are 185.42 and 178.77 respectively. The standard deviation for the variable are 17.15 and 15.97 respectively. The 't' value obtained is 2.82. The table value for 0.01 level of significance is 2.58. Since the obtained 't' value is greater than the table value, the mean difference in the scores of Teacher Efficacy of Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers is found significant at 0.01 level.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy Between Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School** **Teachers**

The mean and standard deviation of the variable Teacher Efficacy for Aided and Unaided Teachers were found out and subjected for the Test of Significance of Difference Between Mean for Large Independent Sample. The data and result of the 't' test for the comparison of Teacher Efficacy between Aided and Unaided Teachers are present in the Table 4.21

TABLE 4.21

**Data and Results of 't' test**

**Between Mean Scores of Teacher Efficacy for**

**Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School** **Teachers.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Aided** | **Unaided** | **'t' value** | **Level of significance** |
| M1 |  | N1 | M2 |  | N2 |
| Teacher Efficacy | 184.26 | 17.63 | 100 | 178.77 | 15.97 | 89 | 2.231 | .05 |

Table 4.21 shows that the mean scores obtained for Teacher Efficacy of Total Aided and unaided Teachers are 184.26, and 178.77 respectively. The corresponding standard deviation are 17.63 and 15.97 respectively. The 't' value obtained is 2.231. The table value for the significant at 0.05 level is 1.96 since the 't' value is greater than the TABLE d value, the difference in mean scores of Teacher Efficacy of Aided and Unaided Teacher is found significant 0.05 level.

**SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS**

 This chapter includes an overview of significant aspects of the stages of conducting the study, the important findings, their educational implications and suggestions for further research.

* 1. **STUDY IN RETROSPECT**

The various aspects relative to the present study like the problems, Variables, Objectives, Hypotheses and Methodology and given below in brief.

* + 1. RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present study was entitled as “INFLUENCE OF TEACHING STYLES ON TEACHER EFFICACY OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS”.

* + 1. VARIABLES OF THE STUDY

The Independent and Dependent Variables selected for the present study are the following

* + - 1. **Independent Variable**

The Independent Variable selected for the study was Teaching Styles

**5.1.2.2 Dependent Variable**

The Dependent Variable selected for the study was Teacher Efficacy.

* + 1. OBJECTIVES

The following are the objectives of the study

5.1.3.1 To identify Teaching Style preferences of Higher Secondary Schoolteachers for the Total sample and Sub Samples formed on the basis of Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

5.1.3.2. To study whether there exists any significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total sample and Sub samples based on Gender, Locale and Type of Management

5.1.3.3 To study whether there exists any significance difference in the Mean Teaching Styles Scores component wise and Total score of Higher Secondary Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

5.1.3.4 To study whether there exists any significant difference in the mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale, and Type of Management.

5.1.4HYPOTHESES

 The following are the hypotheses of the study

* + - 1. There exists significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise ad Total Score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total Sample and relevant Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale, Type of Management.
			2. There exists significant difference in the Mean of Teaching Styles Scores (Component wise and Total Score) of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.
			3. There exists significant difference in the Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management.

**5.1.5** PROCEDURE

 The procedure adopted for the present study is discussed in the following sections.

**5.1.5.1 Sample for the study**

The study was conducted on a sample of 300 Higher Secondary Teachers belonging to three Districts of Kerala ie. Malappuram, Kozhikode and Palakkad.

**5.1.5.2 Tools used for the Study**

The following tools were used for the study.

**a) *Scale of Teaching Styles (Hameed & Manjusha 2008)***

The Independent Variable Teaching Styles was measured using a Scale of Teaching Styles by Hameed and Manjusha (2008).

b) ***Teacher Efficacy Scale (Musthafa & Abidali, 2008)***

The dependent variable Teacher Efficacy was measured using the Teacher Efficacy Scale by Musthafa & Abidali, (2008).

**5.1.5.3**  **Statistical Techniques used for Analysis**

The following statistical techniques were used in the study for the analysis of the data.

a) Mean Difference Analysis

b) Pearson Product Moment Co-efficent Correlation

c) Fisher’s t Test of Significance of 'r'

d) Verbal Interpretation of 'r'

**5.2** **MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

The analysis of the study lead to the following findings.

**5.2.1.** TEACHING STYLE PREFERENCES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND SUB SAMPLES BASED ON GENDER, LOCALE AND TYPE OF MANAGEMENT.

Teaching style preferences for the total sample and sub samples based on gender locale and type of management found to be

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sample** | **Teaching Styles** |
| **Formal authority** | **Demonstrator** | **Facilitator** | **Expert** | **Delegator** |
| **Total** | 13 | 65 | 170 | 6 | 62 |
| Gender | **Male** | 4 | 28 | 40 | 2 | 28 |
| **Female** | 9 | 37 | 130 | 4 | 34 |
| locale  | **Rural** | 7 | 38 | 82 | 3 | 31 |
| **Urban** | 6 | 27 | 88 | 3 | 31 |
| Type of management  | **Govt.** | 2 | 22 | 69 | 1 | 32 |
| **Aided** | 6 | 21 | 45 | 2 | 25 |
| **Unaided** | 5 | 22 | 56 | 3 | 5 |

It was found that the Higher Secondary school Teachers in Kerala (total sample) gives more preference to Facilitator Style of Teaching than other styles. They have shown least preference to Expert Style. It is revealed that the sub samples based on Gender, Locale and Type of management also gives more preference to Facilitator style of Teaching. The Expert style of Teaching was given least preference.

**5.2.2 RESULT OF CORRELATION ANALYSIS**

Relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise and total scores) and Teacher Efficacy for total sample and sub sample based on Gender, Locale and Type of management are found to be

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample** | **Variable** | **'r'** | **Level of Significance** |
| Total | **Formal Authority** | 0.104 | NS |
| **Demonstration** | 0.155 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.233 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.199 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.25 | 0.01 |
| **Total** | 0.299 | 0.01 |
| Male | **Formal Authority** | 0.169 | NS |
| **Demonstration** | 0.139 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.267 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.338 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.303 | 0.01 |
| **Total** | 0.425 | 0.01 |
| Female | **Formal Authority** | 0.064 | NS |
| **Demonstration** | 0.167 | 0.05 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.225 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.115 | NS |
| **Delegator** | 0.213 | 0.01 |
| **Total** | 0.247 | 0.01 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rural | **Formal Authority** | 0.175 | 0.05 |
| **Demonstration** | 0.209 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.262 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.036 | NS |
| **Delegator** | 0.089 | NS |
| **Total** | 0.267 | 0.01 |
| Urban | **Formal Authority** | 0.036 | NS |
| **Demonstration** | 0.091 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.206 | 0.05 |
| **Expert** | 0.323 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.396 | 0.01 |
| **Total** | 0.327 | 0.01 |
| Aided | **Formal Authority** | -0.004 | NS |
| **Demonstration** | 0.118 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.11 | NS |
| **Expert** | 0.354 | 0.01 |
| **Delegator** | 0.263 | 0.01 |
| **Total** | 0.255 | 0.01 |
| Government | **Formal Authority** | 0.237 | 0.01 |
| **Demonstration** | 0.286 | 0.01 |
| **Facilitator** | 0.425 | 0.01 |
| **Expert** | 0.224 | 0.05 |
| **Delegator** | 0.203 | 0.05 |
| **Total** | 0.459 | 0.01 |
| Unaided | **Formal Authority** | 0.086 | NS |
| **Demonstration** | 0.144 | NS |
| **Facilitator** | 0.259 | 0.05 |
| **Expert** | 0.047 | NS |
| **Delegator** | 0.21 | 0.05 |
| **Total** | 0.23 | 0.05 |

NS: Not Significance

**5.2.2.1 Correlation Between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Total Sample.**

All the variables of Teaching style were found positively correlated and significant, except in the case of Formal Authority style of Teaching.

**5.2.2.2 Correlation Between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub Sample Male Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

The correlation between Teaching styles and Teacher Efficacy was found significant for all variables except Formal Authority and Demonstrator style of Teaching.

**5.2.2.3 Correlation between Teaching styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Female Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

All the variables of Teaching Style were positively and significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy except Formal Authority and Expert styles of teaching.

**5.2.2.4 Correlation Between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Rural Higher Secondary School Teachers**.

Except Expert and Delegator styles, all the other variables are positively and significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy.

**5.2.2.5 Correlation Between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

All the variables of Teaching Style were positively and significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy except Formal Authority and Demonstrator styles.

**5.2.2.6 Correlation Between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Government Higher Secondary School Teachers**.

All the variables of Teaching styles were found positively and significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy.

**5.2.2.7 Correlation Between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Government Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

All the variables of Teaching styles were found positively and significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy.

**5.2.2.8 Correlation Between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Unaided Teachers**.

The three variables Formal Authority, Demonstrator, and Expert Teaching styles are positively correlated with Teacher Efficacy, but not significant. The other variables are positively and significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy.

* + 1. RESULTS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE ANALYSIS

Results of comparison of Mean Scores of Variables are the following

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Teaching Style (Component wise and Total score) Score Between Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

It was found that no significant difference exists in the teaching styles (Component wise and Total Score) between Male and Female Teachers.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Score of Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total Score) Between Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

It was noticed that no significant difference exists in the Teaching styles (component wise and total score) between Rural and Urban Teachers.

**5.2.3.3** **Comparison of Mean Teaching Style Scores (Component wise and Total Score) Between Government and Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

It was found that there exist significant difference in between Government and Aided Teachers in Facilitator and Expert styles of Teaching. But no significant difference in other Teaching styles and total scores.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'t' value** | **Level of Significance** |
| Facilitator | 2.37 | 0.05 |
| Expert | -2.18 | 0.05 |

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean score of Teaching Styles ( Component wise and Total Scores ) Between Government and Unaided Teachers.**

It was found that there exist no significant difference between Government and Unaided Teachers in teaching styles scores except Detegator style of teaching. In the case of Delegator Teaching style there exist a significant difference at 0.01 level.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **'t' value** | **Level of Significance** |
| Deligator | 3.13 | 0.01 |

* + - 1. **Comparison of mean Teaching Style Scores ( Component wise and Total Scores ) Between Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers**.

It was Found that there exist no significant different between teaching styles of Aided and Unaided Teachers in Formal Authority and Expert styles of teaching.

The difference in mean scores between Aided and Unaided Teachers was significant in three styles only ie, Demonstrator, Facilitator and Delegator style of Teaching. But the difference in total Teaching styles score is not significant.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **'t' value** | **Level of Significance** |
| Demonstrator | -3.12 | 0.01 |
| Facilitator | -2.49 | 0.05 |
| Deligator | 3.22 | 0.01 |

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores Between Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

It was found that there exist no significant difference in the mean of Teacher Efficacy score of Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores Between Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

When comparisons were made, significant difference was not found in the mean Teacher Efficacy score of Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores Between Government and Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

The result shows that the difference between the mean Teacher Efficacy scores was not found significant for the sub samples Government and Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers.

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Teacher Efficacy Scores between Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers.**

It was noticed that significant difference exists in the mean of Teacher Efficacy Scores of Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **'t' value** | **Level of Significance** |
| Teacher Efficacy | 2.82 | 0.01 |

* + - 1. **Comparison of Mean Teacher Efficacy Score of Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers**.

The difference between mean Teacher Efficacy score of Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers was found to be significant.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **'t' value** | **Level of Significance** |
| Teacher Efficacy | 2.23 | 0.05 |

* 1. **TENABILITY OF HYPOTHESES**

Based on the major findings, the tenability of the hypotheses set for the present study was examined.

**5.3.1** The first hypothesis state that "There exists significant relationship between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total score) and Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers for the Total Sample and relevant Sub samples based on Gender, Locale, and Type of Management."

 The co-efficient of correlation obtained between Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total Score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Total sample were provide to be significant except in the case of Formal Authority style of Teaching. Hence the hypothesis was partially substantiated for the total sample.

 Except Formal Authority and Demonstrator Teaching styles, all the variables of Teaching styles were found significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Male Higher Secondary School Teachers. There fore the hypothesis was partially substantiated for the Male Higher Secondary School Teachers.

 All the variables of Teaching style were significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy, except Formal Authority and Expert Styles of Teaching. Hence the Hypothesis was partially substantiated for the Female Higher Secondary School Teachers.

 The coefficient of correlation obtained between Teaching Style (Component wise and Total Score) and Teacher Efficacy for the Sub sample Rural Higher Secondary Teachers were provide significant, except in the case of Expert and Delegator Styles of Teaching. Hence the hypothesis was partially substantiated for the sub sample Rural Higher Secondary School Teachers.

 All the variables of Teaching Style were significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy, except Formal Authority and Demonstrator Styles. This shows that the hypothesis was partially substantiated for the sub sample Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers.

 Except three variables of Teaching Style, all the variables of Teaching Styles were correlated significantly with Teacher Efficacy of Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers. Then the hypothesis was partially substantiated for the sub sample Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers.

 In the case of the sub sample Government Higher Secondary Teachers, all the variables of Teaching Styles were found significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy. Hence the hypothesis holds good for the sub sample Government Higher Secondary School Teachers.

 For the sub sample Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers, the three variables Formal Authority, Demonstrator and Expert Styles of Teaching were not significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy. But the others were significantly correlated with Teacher Efficacy. So the hypothesis was partially substantiated for the sub sample Unaided Teachers.

**5.3.2** The Second Hypothesis state "that there exists significant difference in the mean Teaching Styles scores (Component wise and Total Score) of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management".

 When comparisons were made, no significant difference was found to exist in the Mean Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total Score) of Male and Female Teachers. So this hypothesis was not found valid for Sub sample based on Gender.

When comparisons were made, no significant difference was found to exist in the Mean Teaching Styles (Component wise and Total Score) of Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers. So this hypothesis is not found valid for Sub sample based on Locale.

Between Government and Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers, it was found to be exists a significant difference in mean Facilitator and Expert Teaching Styles scores. But no significant difference in other Teaching Style component and Total score.

In the case of Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers, no significant difference was found to exist in the mean Teaching Styles scores except Delegator Style of Teaching.

When comparisons were made, significant difference was found to exist in the mean Teaching Styles scores of Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers in three Styles. Hence the hypothesis is found partially true for the Sub samples based on Type of Management.

* + 1. The third hypothesis states that "there exists significant difference in the mean Teacher Efficacy score of Higher Secondary School Teachers with regard to Gender, Locale and Type of Management".

When comparisons were made, no significant difference was found to be exists between mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Male and Female Higher Secondary School Teachers. Hence the hypothesis was not accepted for the Sub sample based on Gender.

No significant difference was found to be exists in mean Teacher Efficacy scores of Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Teachers. There for the hypothesis was not accepted for the Sub sample based on Locale.

The difference between the mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Government and Aided Higher Secondary School Teachers was found to be not significant.

However significant difference was found to be exist in mean Teacher Efficacy Scores between Government and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teachers.

The difference in mean Teacher Efficacy Scores of Aided and Unaided Higher Secondary School Teacher was found to be significant Hence the third hypothesis was partially substantiated in the case of Sub samples based on Type of Management.

**5.4** **EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY.**

 The present study was to find out the Influence of Teaching Styles on Teacher Efficacy of Higher Secondary School Teachers in three Districts ie. Malappuram, Kohikode and pallakkad.

 Based on the results obtained from the study some of the practical suggestions are offered which will be helpful to improve the existing Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy of higher Secondary School Teachers.

 Based on the findings the investigator has the following suggestion.

The findings revealed that the Teacher give more preference to Facilitator Style. It is quiet related to the present curriculum. More over Facilitator Style is essential for the well functioning of the present curriculum in Kerala.

Since there is a positive relationship between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy, the students will be benefited from this positive correlation. Various Teaching Styles are positively influenced Teacher Efficacy. There for Teachers can adopt those Styles for improving the Teaching process.

The positive correlation between Teaching Styles and Teacher Efficacy can bring improvement in learners' achievement. Hence the Teachers should adopt those Styles that have positive correlation with Teacher Efficacy.

While adopting a particular Teaching Style it should be related with Teacher Efficacy. So that the learners can be benefited out of it. It has found that there is no difference between Male and Female Teachers in Teaching Style. The Teachers can adopt various Teaching Styles and it will positively influence their Efficacy.

**5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.**

 Further research is possible in areas suggested are the following .

1. This study can be replicated in primary and secondary teachers.
2. The study can be conducted on the effect of other personality variable on Teacher Efficacy of Teachers.
3. Experimental study can be conducted to find out the effectiveness of different Teaching Styles.
4. The present study can be extended to other districts of Kerala also.
5. Teaching Style and Teacher Efficacy of college teachers can be studied.
6. Studies on Teaching Styles in relation to student achievement can be conducted.
7. Relationship between Teaching Style and other teacher specific variables can be studied.
8. Teaching Styles perceived by students can be studied.
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**APPENDIX IA**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE, CALICUT**

**SCALE OF TEACHING STYLES-2008**

**Dr. A. Hammed Manjsha.M**

LECTURER IN EDUCATION

Farook Training College

**Instructions**

 This scale is prepared for measurement of Teaching Styles. The scale has two parts, first part is for your personal data and second part consist of various statements related to Teaching Styles. Mark your response to the given statements as Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely and Never in the boxes given on the right side of the statements. You can give your responses after reading each statement in boxes (✓) using this symbol. If you want to change the answer already marked you an darken the box …… and then put the symbol (✓) in the response box.

 The information obtained will be rightly confidential and is only used for the research purpose.

1. Male/Female :
2. Age :
3. Married :
4. Native District :
5. Educational Qualification :
6. Year of Appointment :
7. Experience :
8. Locality : Rural/Urban

**INFORMATION ABOUT INSTITUTION**

1. Name of the Institution :
2. Locality :
3. School : Government/Aided/Unaided
4. Nature of the School : Boys only/Girls only/Co-education

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| 1 | I seek the opinion of my colleagues whenever I have doubt in my subject. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | For classroom planning I use only course book and Teacher’s handbook. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | I think that visiting the library is a waste of time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Modern Technological devices like OHP,LCD etc are used by me in the classroom. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Journal are made use of to improve my abilities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | By acquiring new knowledge my abilities can be improved |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | I do not encourage pupils’s curiosity |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | My knowledge is completely useful to the pupils  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | I plan the learning activities in a way that help the pupils to do the follow up activities  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | I tell only mattrs within the syllabus to the pupils  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  Pupils don’t rise to my standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | I am very particular that the pupil must prepare notes for the topic I take in the classroom |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | I ask questions to the pupils while taking class. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | I give preference to the examples I give in the classroom. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 | I don’t discuss my subject matters with my colleagues. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | I encourage the pupils when they respond correctly |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | In academic matters I don’t consider the participation of pupils  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | I give preface to group activities I give proper instructions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | When pupils engage in group activities I give proper instructions |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Usully I neglect the false from the side of pupils during group activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | I am particular that al the pupils in my class must actively participate in the group activates. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | The result of the activities of the group is made to be evaluated by the pupils in my presence. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | I consider group activities as waste of time. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | I give the pupils the freedom to ask about their doubts at any time. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | I select a leader from each group. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | I select the group leader based on leadership qualities than marks. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | I give instructions only to the group leader. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Charts have a big role in making the lasses effective. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | Pupils consider me as an ideal personality. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Use of working models in teaching strengthen the memory power of pupils. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Only my decisions are considered in the classroom. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | I give useful examples to the students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | I can never accept questioning my teaching method. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | I don’t encourage pupils in learning activities outside the classroom. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Pupils should understand the topics as I do. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36  | I have total satisfaction in my teaching method. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | I don’t give preference to interaction between pupil and Teacher in the classroom. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Pupils understand their topics through self doing activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | I provide situations to the pupils to do activities according to their interest. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | I don’t impose my opinion on pupils to do activities according to their interest. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | I permit the pupils to do their projects individually or in groups. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | I am not particular whether the students do their project on time. |  |  |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX I**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE, CALICUT**

**SCALE OF TEACHING STYLES**

**Dr. A. Hameed Manjusha M.**

Lecturer in Education

Farook Training College

**\nÀt±-i-§Ä**

 A[ym-]\ coXn-I-sf-¡p-dn¨v Adn-bp-¶-Xn-\pÅ Hcp am\-I-am-Wn-Xv. CXn\v c­v `mK-§Ä D­v. H¶mw `mK-¯nÂ Xm¦-fpsS hyàn-]-c-amb hnh-c-§Ä BWv \ÂtI-­-Xv. c­mw `mK-¯nÂ A[ym-]-\-co-Xn-bp-ambn \_Ô-s¸« {]kvXm-h-\-I-fmWv sImSp-¯n-cn-¡p-¶-Xv. Hmtcm {]kvXm-h-\¡pwt\sc "FÃm-b-t¸mgpw', "an¡-t¸mgpw', "Nne-t¸m-sgms¡', "A]qÀÆw', "Hcn-¡-ep-anÃ' F¶n-§s\ A©v {]Xn-I-c-W-§sf kqNn-¸n-¡p¶ NXp-c-§Ä tcJ-s¸-Sp-¯n-bn-«p-­v. Hmtcm {]kvXm-h-\bpw hmbn-¨-Xn-\p-tijw Xm¦Ä¡v A\p-tbmPyw F¶p-tXm-¶p¶ {]Xn-I-c-Ws¯ kqNn-¸n-¡p¶ NXp-c-¯nÂ 🗹NnÓw CSp-I. Hcn-¡Â tcJ-s¸-Sp-¯nb {]Xn-I-cWw amä-W-sa-¦nÂ BZyw tcJ-s¸-Sp-¯nb NXpcw ]qÀ®-ambpw Idp-¸n-¨-Xn-\p-tijw (◼) icn-bm-bn-«pÅ {]Xn-I-cWw 🗹 NnÓ-an«v ho­pw tcJ-s¸-Sp-¯p-I.

 CXn-eqsS e`n-¡p¶ hnh-c-§Ä hfsc cl-ky-ambn kq£n-¡p-¶-Xm-sW¶pw Kth-j-Wm-h-iy-¯n-\p-th­n am{Xta D]-tbm-Kn-¡p-I-bpÅp F¶pw Dd¸v \ÂIp-¶p.

**hyàn-]-c-amb hnh-c-§Ä**

1. ]pcp-j³ / kv{Xo :

2. hbÊv :

3. hnhm-lnX / hnhm-ln-X³ :

4. kz´w PnÃ :

5. hnZym-`ymk tbmKyX :

6. {]hÀ¯n ]cn-Nbw :

7. Øew : \Kcw / {Kmaw

8. ]Tn-¸n-¡p¶ hnjbw :

**hnZym-e-b-kw-\_-Ô-amb hnh-c-§Ä :**

1. hnZym-e-b-¯nsâ t]cv :

2. Øew : \Kcw / {Kmaw

3. kvIqÄ : Kh¬saâv / FbvUUv / A¬ FbvUUv

4. hnZym-e-b-¯nsâ kz`mhw : B¬Ip-«n-IÄ am{Xw /

 s]¬Ip-«n-IÄ am{Xw /

 an{i-hn-Zym-ebw

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | FÃm-bvt¸mgpw | an¡-t¸mgpw | Nne-t¸m-sgms¡ | A]qÀÆw | Hcn-¡-ep-anÃ |
| 1 | Fsâ hnj-b-¯nÂ kwi-b-§Ä D­m-Ip-t¼m-sgÃmw kl-{]-hÀ¯-I-cnÂ\n¶v Rm³ A`n-{]mbw tXSm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 2 | t\_m[-\m-kq-{X-W-¯n-\mbn Rm³ ]mT-]p-kvX-Ihpw A[ym-]-\-k-lm-bnbpw am{Xta D]-tbm-Kn-¡m-dpÅq | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 3 | sse{\_-dn-bnÂ t]mIp-¶Xv Hcp ka-b-\-jvS-am-bmWv Rm³ IW-¡m-¡p-¶Xv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 4 | B[p-\nI kmt¦Xn hnZy-I-fmb HmhÀslUv s{]mP-IvSÀ, LCD s{]mP-IvSÀ F¶nh Rm³ ¢mÊv dqanÂ D]-tbm-Kn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 5 | Fsâ Ign-hp-IÄ sa¨-s¸-Sp-¯p-¶-Xn-\p-th­n B\p-Im-enI {]kn-²o-I-c-W-§Ä {]tbm-P-\-s¸-Sp-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 6 | ]pXnb Adn-hp-IÄ BÀÖn-¡p-¶-Xn-eqsS Fsâ Ign-hp-IÄ sa¨-s¸-Sp-¯m³ km[n¡pw | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 7 | Rm³ Ip«n-I-fpsS PnÚm-ksb t{]mÕm-¸n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 8 | Fsâ Adn-hp-IÄ Ip«n-IÄ¡v ]qÀ®-ambpw D]-Im-c-{]-Z-amWv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 9 | Ip«n-IÄ¡v XpSÀ{]-hÀ¯-\-¯n\v klm-b-I-am-Ipw-hn-[-amWv ]T-\-{]-hÀ¯-\-§Ä Rm³ Bkq-{XWw sN¿p-¶Xv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 10 | ]mTy-]-²-Xn-bn-epÅ Imcy-§Ä am{Xta Rm³ Ip«n-IÄ¡v ]d-ªp-sIm-Sp-¡m-dpÅq | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 11 | Ip«n-IÄ Fsâ \ne-hm-c-¯n-\-\p-k-cn¨v Db-cm-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 12 | Rm³ FSp-¡p¶ ]mT-`m-K-¯nse Ipdn-¸p-IÄ Ip«n-IÄ X¿m-dm-¡-W-sa¶v F\n¡v \nÀ\_-Ô-amWv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 13 | ¢mkv FSp-¯p-sIm-­n-cn-¡p-t¼mÄ Ip«n-I-tfmSv Rm³ tNmZy-§Ä tNmZn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 14 | ¢mkv dqanÂ Rm³ ]d-bp¶ DZm-l-c-W-§Ä¡mWv ap³Xq¡w sImSp-¡mdpÅXv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 15 | kl-A-[ym-]-I-cp-ambn Rm³ Fsâ hnj-b-§Ä NÀ¨ sN¿m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 16 | Ip«n-IÄ icn-bmb {]Xn-I-cWw \ÂIp-t¼mÄ Rm³ Ahsc t{]mÕm-ln¸n-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 17 | ]T-\-Im-cy-§-fnÂ Ip«n-I-fpsS ]¦m-fn¯w Rm³ ]cn-K-Wn-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 18 | ¢mÊnÂ kwL-{]-hÀ¯-\-§Ä¡mWv Rm³ ap³Xq¡w sImSp-¡p-¶Xv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 19 | hnZymÀ°n-IÄ kwL-{]-hÀ¯-\-§-fnÂ GÀs¸-Sp-t¼mÄ Rm³ A\p-tbm-Py-amb \nÀt±-i-§Ä sImSp-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 20 | kwL-{]-hÀ¯-\-¯n-\n-S-bnÂ hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS `mK-¯p-\n-¶p-­m-Ip¶ ]ng-hp-IÄ Rm³ Ah-K-Wn-¡p-I-bmWv sN¿m-dp-ÅXv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 21 | Fsâ ¢mÊnse FÃm hnZymÀ°n-Ifpw kwL-{]-hÀ¯-\-§-fnÂ ]s¦-Sp-¡-W-sa¶v F\n¡v \nÀ\_-Ô-ap­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 22 | FÃm kwL-¯n-sâbpw {]hÀ¯-\-^-e-§Ä Fsâ km¶n-[y-¯nÂ Ip«n-I-sf-s¡m­pXs¶ aqey-\nÀ®bw \S-¯n-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 23 | kwL-{]-hÀ¯-\-§Ä Hcp ka-b-\-jvS-am-bn-«mWv Rm³ Icp-Xp-¶Xv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 24 | Ip«n-IÄ¡v Ah-cp-tS-Xmb kwi-b-§Ä GX-h-k-c-¯nepw tNmZn-¡m-\pÅ kzmX{´yw Rm³ \ÂIm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 25 | FÃm kwL-¯nÂ\n¶pw Hmtcm Xe-h-·msc Rm³ sXc-sª-Sp-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 26 | kwL-¯-e-hs\ Rm³ Xnc-sª-Sp-¡m-dp-ÅXv amÀ¡n-t\-¡m-fp-]cn t\Xr-]m-Shw IW-¡n-se-Sp-¯mWv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 27 | kwL-¯-e-h\v am{Xta Rm³ \nÀt±-i-§Ä sImSp-¡m-dpÅq | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 28 | ¢mÊp-IÄ ^e-{]-Z-am-¡p-¶-Xn\v NmÀ«p-IÄ hfsc henb ]¦p-h-ln-¡p-¶p­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 29 | hnZymÀ°n-IÄ Fs¶ amXr-Im-hy-àn-bmbn IW-¡m-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 30 | A[ym-]-\-¯nÂ {]hÀ¯\ amXr-I-IÄ D]-tbm-Kn-¡p-¶Xv Ip«n-I-fpsS HmÀ½sb iàn-s¸-Sp¯pw | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 31 | ¢mÊnÂ Ftâ-Xmb Xocp-am-\-§Ä am{Xta ]cn-K-Wn-¡m-dpÅq | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 32 | hnZymÀ°n-IÄ¡v D]-tbm-K-{]-Z-am-Ip¶ DZm-l-c-W-§-fmWv Rm³ \ÂIm-dp-ÅXv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 33 | Fsâ A[ym-]-\-co-Xnsb tNmZyw sN¿p-¶Xv F\n¡v AwKo-I-cn-¡m³ Ign-bnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 34 | ¢mÊn\v ]pd-¯pÅ ]T-\-{]-hÀ¯-\-§-fnÂ Ip«n-Isf Rm³ t{]mÕm-ln-¸n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 35 | ]Tn-¸n-¡p¶ `mK-§Ä Rm³ a\-Ên-em-¡p-¶-Xp-t]m-se-Xs¶ hnZymÀ°n-Ifpw a\-Ên-em-¡Ww | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 36 | Fsâ A[ym-]-\-co-Xn-bnÂ F\n¡v ]qÀ® kwXr-]vXn-bp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 37 | ¢mÊnÂ A[ym-]-Icpw hnZymÀ°n-Ifpw X½n-epÅ Bi-b-hn-\n-a-b-¯n\v Rm³ ap³K-W\ \ÂIm-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 38 | ]mT-`m-K-§Ä Ip«n-IÄ a\-Ên-em-¡p-¶Xv AhÀ kzbw sN¿p¶ {]hÀ¯-\-§-fn-eq-sS-bmWv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 39 | Ah-c--h-cpsS XmXv]cyw A\p-k-cn¨v {]hÀ¯-\-§Ä sN¿m-\pÅ kml-Ncyw Rm³ Ip«n-IÄ¡v \ÂIm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 40 | Fsâ A`n-{]m-b-§Ä Ip«n-I-fpsStaÂ ASnt¨Â¸n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 41 | s{]mP-Iväp-IÄ hyàn-]-c-ambpw kwL-§-fmbpw sN¿m³ hnZymÀ°n-Isf Rm³ A\p-h-Zn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 42 | ka-b-\_-Ôn-X-ambn Ip«n-IÄ s{]mPIväv sN¿m-dpt­m F¶v Rm³ {i²n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

**APPENDIX II**

**FAROOK TRAINING COLLEGE, CALICUT**

**TEACHER EFFICACY SCALE**

**Dr. Mohamedunni Alias Musthafa M.N. Abidali E.**

Lecturer

Department of Education

Calicut University

**hyàn-]-c-amb hnh-c-§Ä**

1. ]pcp-j³ / kv{Xo :

2. hbÊv :

3. hnhm-lnX / hnhm-ln-X³ :

4. kz´w PnÃ :

5. hnZym-`ymk tbmKyX :

6. {]hÀ¯n ]cn-Nbw :

7. Øew : \Kcw / {Kmaw

8. ]Tn-¸n-¡p¶ hnjbw :

**hnZym-e-b-kw-\_-Ô-amb hnh-c-§Ä :**

1. hnZym-e-b-¯nsâ t]cv :

2. Øew : \Kcw / {Kmaw

3. kvIqÄ : Kh¬saâv / FbvUUv /

 A¬ FbvUUv

4. hnZym-e-b-¯nsâ kz`mhw : B¬Ip-«n-IÄ am{Xw /

 s]¬Ip-«n-IÄ am{Xw /

 an{i-hn-Zym-ebw

Xmsg sImSp-¯n-cn-¡p¶ {]kvXm-h-\-IÄ¡v t\sc \n§-fpsS {]Xn-I-cWw F{]-Im-c-am-sW¶v tImf-¯nÂ AS-bm-f-s¸-Sp-¯p-I. \n§-fpsS {]Xn-I-c-W-§Ä Kth-j-W-¯n\v am{Xta D]-tbm-K-s¸-Sp-¯p-I-bp-Åq.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | ]qÀ®-ambpw tbmPn-¡p¶p | tbmPn-¡p¶p | A`n-{]m-b-anÃ | hntbm-Pn-¡p¶p | ]qÀ®-ambn hntbm-Pn-¡p¶p |
| 1 | ¢mÊnÂ ]mT-`m-K-¯n-\-\p-k-cn-¨pÅ coXn-IÄ Ah-ew-\_n-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 2 | So¨nwKv sa¨-s¸-Sp-¯m³ hnZymÀ°n-I-fnÂ\n¶pw feedback tcJ tiJ-cn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 3 | aps¶m-cp-¡-§Ä \S-¯n-b-ti-jta ¢msÊ-Sp-¡m-dpÅq | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 4 | ]T-\-{]-hÀ¯-\-§-fnÂ hnZymÀ°n ]¦m-fn¯w Dd¸v hcp-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 5 | t\_m[\w ^e-{]-Z-am-¡m³ A[ym-]-\-k-a-b¯v So¨nwKv FbvUv D]-tbm-Kn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 6 | hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS am\-kn-Im-hØ a\-Ên-em¡n A[ym-]\w \S-¯m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 7 | hnZymÀ°n-IÄ¡v \ÂIm-dpÅ tlmwhÀ¡p-IÄ ]T-\-{]-hÀ¯-\s¯ Ffp-¸-am-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 8 | hnZymÀ°n-Isf hf-sc-b-[nIw kvt\ln-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 9 | kXy-k-Ô-X-tbm-sS-bmWv hnZymÀ°n-I-tfmSv s]cp-am-dm-dp-ÅXv | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 10 | hnZymÀ°n-I-fnÂ t\Xr-Xz-]m-Shw hfÀ¯m³ {ian-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 11 | hnj-b-kw-\_-Ô-amb kwi-b-§Ä D­m-bmÂ hnZ-KvZ-cnÂ\n¶pw \nhm-cWw \S-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 12 | FÃm hnZymÀ°n-I-fp-sSbpw Ign-hp-Ifpw ]cn-an-Xn-Ifpw a\-Ên-em¡n s]cp-am-dm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 13 | \nÊm-c-Im-cy-§Ä¡v hnZymÀ°n-Isf hg¡v ]d-bm-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 14 | hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS hnj-am-hØ a\-Ên-em-¡m³ Ign-bm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 15 | km¼-¯n-I-ambn ]cm-[o-\-X-I-f-\p-`-hn-¡p¶ hnZymÀ°n-Isf hyàn-]-c-ambn klm-bn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 16 | ]T-\-{]-hÀ¯-\-§-fnÂ Xmev]cyw Ipdª Ip«n-Isf motivate sN¿m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 17 | Hmtcm Ip«n-sbbpw Ah-cpsS Ign-hp-IÄ a\-Ên-em¡n t{]mÕm-ln-¸n-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 18 | Hmtcm hÀj-s¯bpw hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS hnP-b-s¯-¡mÄ ASp-¯-hÀjw sa¨-s¸-Sp-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 19 | Ip«n-I-fpsS \_p²n-hn-Im-k-¯n-\m-h-iy-amb Ah-k-c-§Ä ]T-\-{]-hÀ¯-\-§Ä¡n-S-bnÂ krjvSn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 20 | ¢mÊnÂ Fs´-¦nepw Xocp-am-\-sa-Sp-t¡-­-Xm-bn-h-cp-t¼mÄ hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS A`n-{]mbw am\n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 21 | A[ym-]-I³ F¶ \ne-bnÂ kaq-l-¯nÂ\n¶pw \Ã ]cn-K-W\ e`n-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 22 | IqSp-XÂ kabw ¢msÊ-Sp-t¡-­-Xmbn hcp-t¼mÄ {]bm-k-ap-­m-Im-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 23 | Ip«n-IÄ¡n-S-bnÂ Hcp amXr-Im-²ym-]-I-\mbn s]cp-am-dm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 24 | kÀ¤-hm-k-\-IÄ A[ym-]-\-¯nÂ D]-tbm-Kn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 25 | A[ym-]\w sa¨-s¸-Sp-¯m³ sse{\_dn D]-tbm-K-s¸-Sp-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 26 | hnj-b-¯n-epÅ Ah-Kmlw t\Sm³In«p¶ Ah-k-c-§Ä D]-tbm-K-s¸-Sp-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 27 | A[ym-]-\-¯nÂ Fsâ bYmÀ° Ignhv ]pd-s¯-Sp-¡m³ km[n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 28 | hnZymÀ°n-IÄ¡v GXv Ah-k-c-¯nepw amÀ¤-\nÀt±-i-§Ä \ÂIm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 29 | kvIqfn\v ]pd-¯m-bn-cn-¡p-t¼mÄ hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS Imcy-§-fnÂ CS-s]-Sm-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 30 | ¢mÊnÂ hcm-Xn-cn-¡p¶ Ip«n-I-sf-¡p-dn¨v Ah-cpsS c£n-Xm-¡-tfmSv At\z-jn-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 31 | aäpÅ A[ym-]-IÀ eohm-Ip-t¼mÄ Ah-cpsS ¢mÊp-IÄ ssIImcyw sN¿m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 32 | amÀ¡v Ipdª Ip«n-Isf hf-sc-b-[nIw {i²n-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 33 | Ip«n-I-fpsS Ign-hn-Ãm-bvasb aäp-Å-hÀ¡n-S-bnÂsh¨v t\_m[y-s¸-Sp-¯m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 34 | ¢mÊn\v ]pd-¯m-sW-¦nepw hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS kwi-b-§Ä¡v amÀ¤-\nÀt±iw \ÂIm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 35 | IrXy-k-a-b-¯p-Xs¶ ]mT-`m-K-§Ä XoÀ¯v dnhn-j³ \S-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 36 | Fsâ ¢mÊnse Ip«n-IÄ FÃm Imcy-¯nepw A\p-k-c-W-]p-eÀ¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 37 | ]T\{]-hÀ¯-\-§Ä \S-¡p-t¼mÄ i\_vZ-ap-J-cn-X-ambn ¢mÊv Ae-t¦m-e-s¸-Sm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 38 | X\n-¡-dn-bm¯ Imcy-§Ä Bcp-sS-ap-¶nepw Xpd¶v k½-Xn-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 39 | Nne ka-b-§-fnÂ £a-ssI-h-cn-¡m³ km[n-¡m-dnÃ | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 40 | ^e-{]-Z-amb Bi-b-hn-\n-a-b-¯n-eqsS Ip«n-I-fnÂ A¨-S-¡-ap-­m-¡m³ Ign-bm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 41 | sXäp-kw-`-hn-¨mÂ hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS ap¶nÂ Xpd¶p]d-bm³ Ign-bm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 42 | ]pXnb ]mT-`m-K-§Ä ¢mÊnÂ Ah-X-cn-¸n-¡p-t¼mÄ ]T-t\m-t±-iy-§Ä t\Sm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 43 | c£m-IÀXr-tbm-K-§-fnÂ hnZymÀ°n-I-fpsS D¶-a-\-¯n-\m-bpÅ D]-tZ-i-§Ä c£n-Xm-¡Ä¡v \ÂIm-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 44 | Bi-b-¡p-g-¸-apÅ hkvXp-X-IÄ DZm-l-c-W-k-lnXw hyà-am-¡n-s¡m-Sp-¡m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| 45 | hnZymÀ°n-I-fnÂ kmaq-ly-{]-Xn-\_-²X hfÀ¯m-\pÅ t\_m[\w \S-¯m-dp­v | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

**APPENDIX II A**

**FAROOK TRAININIG COLLEGE, CALICUT**

**TEACHER EFFICACY SCALE – 2008**

Dr. Mohamedunni Alias Musthafa Abidali. E

Lecture in Education

University of Calicut

**SECTION – A**

***Personal information****:*

1. Male or Female. :
2. Age :
3. Locality (urban/ rural) :
4. Native District :
5. Educational qualification :
6. Teaching Experience :
7. Subject Taught :

***Information Regarding the Institution***

1. Name of the institution :
2. Locality (Urban/ Rural) :
3. Type of management :

(Govt / Aided / Unaided)

**SECTION – B**

You have to respond each statements in columns described below

This information use only for research purpose.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl.No | Statements  | Strongly agree | Agree | Un decided  | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | I resort methods which are suitable to the lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | I collect feed back from the students to improve teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | I take classes after much planning much preparations. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | I ensure the participation of pupils in learning activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | I make my classes more effective, I incline on teaching aids. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | I don’t consider the mental states of students White Teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | The home work which are assigned to the students make the learning process simple. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | I am very affectionate to my students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | I keep high sincerity in my dealings to pupils. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | I try to develop leadership qualities in the students |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | if I have any doubts regarding the subject I clarify with the experts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | I recognize the strength and weaknesses of pupils in my dealings with them. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | I don’t scold my students for silly matters. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | I can understand the problems of my students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | I help the students of poor financial background. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | I don’t motivate students who are indifferent to studies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | In encourage each and every student on the basis of their abilities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | I take measures to improve the result than the previous year.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | I find opportunities for the intellectual development of the students during learning process. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | I don’t consider students opinion whenever decision in to be taken in the class. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | I get enough consideration from the society as a teacher.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | I don’t feel any difficulties in taking extra time classes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | I behave as a model teacher among my students. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | I apply creative strategies in the teaching process.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | I utilize library to improve my teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | I utilize those opportunities which a good mastery of the subject. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | I am not able exhibit my talents in teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | I provide right direction to my students in any situation |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | I don’t interfere the students affairs outside the school. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | I don’t enquire to the parents of those students who are irregular in the class.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | I don’t attempt the classes of other teachers when they are in leave. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | I give special attention to the below average students also  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | I don’t disclose my student’s inabilities before others. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | I clarify the doubts of the students even onside the class room |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | I complete the 15 times and make revisions  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | My students show obedience in every matters. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | I miss the classroom management when learning activities are provided. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | I sometimes loose my temper. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | I admit my ignorance before others. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | I succeed in maintaining discipline in the classroom with effective communication. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | I am not hesitate to admit my fault before my pupils. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | I can attain the curricular objectives whit the new lessons are introduced. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 | I suggest measures for the students progress in P. T. A meetings. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44 | I make use instances to clarify facts which are too confusing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | I make teaching to foster the social awareness. |  |  |  |  |  |