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INTRODUCTION

Teacher is the most vital single factor of influence in the system of education. It is the teacher who matters most as far as the quality of education is concerned. The educational process is governed by the extent of his receptivity and initiative. The well equipped teacher is supreme in education. At all times the teacher is the pivot in the system of education.

The Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) points out that “every teacher and educationist of experience knows that even the best curriculum and the most perfect syllabus remain dead unless quickened into life by the right methods of teaching and right kind of teachers”.

The Education Commission (1964-66) has very aptly observed that “the future of the nation is shaped in her classrooms”. It is the teacher that moulds the most precious material of land, viz. the boys and the girls in their most impressionable period of development in the required shapes.

The teachers are identified good or poor, effective or ineffective on the basis of personal characteristics, because personal qualities of a teacher have different effects on the behaviour of students. While reviewing the research on personal characteristics of good versus poor teachers, Hamacheek (1969) concluded that: effective teachers appear to be those who are, “human” in the fullest sense of the word. They have a sense of humours, are fair, empathetic, and apparently are more able to relate easily and naturally to students on either a one-to-one or group basis. Their classroom seems to reflect miniature enterprise operation in the sense that they are more open, spontaneous, and adaptable to change.

At one point of time, it was assumed that a person was a good teacher if he was a good scholar. The reasoning was simple, if a teacher knew his subject matter, he could teach others. There is some truth in this statement, but subject matter knowledge does not bridge the gap between teaching and learning. This
fact can be noticed at college and university level some of the knowledgeable professors are not the best teachers. Many a times we hear the comment that, 'He knows his stuff, but can’t communicate. He can get his material across, or 'he talks over our heads'. These type of comments reveal that scholarship of the subject is not enough. Clear communication of the subject matter is essential. However, it does not mean that knowledge of subject is not important. Some teachers who are expert in communication and lack mastery of the subject also need the criticism like that, “he is a good orator, good communicator but does not know the subject”.

Recently it has been emphasized that effective or exemplary teachers teach with styles and make a difference in learners achievement gains and better effective responses from students.

1.1 THE CONCEPT OF STYLE

According to Webster’s New World Dictionary, a style is a distinctive characteristic manner... or method of acting or performing. Jonassen and Grabowsk (1983) hold that styles do not represent abilities but rather a set of preferences. Styles may have closed relationship with ability but they are different from abilities.

1.1.1 Characteristics of Style

Sternberg (1997) has enumerated fifteen characteristic of styles:

- Styles are preferences in the use of abilities, not abilities themselves.
- A match between styles and abilities creates a synergy that is more than the sum of its parts.
- Life choices need to fit styles as well as abilities.
- People have profiles of styles, not just a single style.
- Styles are variables across tasks and situations.
- People differ in the strength of their preferences.
- People differ in their stylistic flexibility.
- Styles are socialized.
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> Styles can vary across the life span.
> Styles are measurable.
> Styles are teachable.
> Styles valued at one time may not be valued in another.
> Styles are not, on average, good or bad.
> We confuse stylistic fill with levels of abilities.

1.1.2 Brief History of Style

Historically speaking, the term 'styles' appeared in the literature for the first time in 1921 in the research of Carl Jung on psychological types. Thereafter the word 'style' was used by G.W. Allport into his work in 1930. Since Allport time the term has been modified and imbued with different meaning but the core definition of style that is its reference to habitual pattern or preferred ways of doing something (e.g. thinking, learning, teaching) that are consistence over long period of time and across many areas of activity remains virtually the same.

However, first movement came into prominence in the 1950's and early 1960's with the idea that styles could provide a bridge between the study of cognition (e.g. how we perceive, how we learn, how we think) and the study of personality. The movement was called the cognitive style movement. A number of cognitive styles were proposed, all of which seemed somewhat closer to cognition than to personality.

A glaring example of such style is field dependence-independence suggested by Herman Witkin. The term cognitive style referred to an individual's way of processing information. The term was developed by cognitive psychologists conducting research into problem solving and sensory and perceptual abilities. The research provided some of the first evidence for the existence of distinctive styles.

A second movement also has attempted to understand 'styles' but in a way that resembles the conceptualization and measurement of personality more than of cognition. Therefore, they are labelled as personality centered styles.
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Styles derived by Myers and Myers from the work of C.G. Jung and theory of styles suggested by Anthony Gregorc come in this category.

The third movement attempted to understand styles that appear to close to behaviour or action of a person. They are, in fact, activity centered or action centered styles. These styles are popular by the name of learning styles. They deal with how people like to learn. Kolb’s theory and Dunn and Dunn’s theory have explained such styles. Apart from learning styles, Holland’s theory of styles used primarily in occupational world also come in the category.

Figure 1.1
Three Landmarks in the History of Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognition Centered Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality Centered Styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centered Styles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently the term thinking styles has been used by psychologists. They are concerned with how people think. Work of Sternberg is a good example of such styles. Like that of cognitive styles, problem solving styles decision making styles thinking styles, hemispheric styles, intellective styles and creativity styles, the term teaching styles has been extensively used.

1.1.3 Differences Between Styles and Strategies

‘Strategies’ usually imply operations followed to minimize error during the decision-making process. At a basic level styles and strategies can be distinguished by the degree of ‘consciousness’ involved. Styles operate without individual awareness, whereas, strategies involve a conscious choice of alternatives. Some authors use the two terms interchangeably (Cronbach and Snow, 1977), but in general, strategy is used for task or context dependent situations, whereas style implies a higher degree of stability falling midway between ability and strategy.
1.2 THINKING STYLES

1.2.1 Concept of Thinking Styles

Thinking styles are the individuals preferred ways of using abilities. These are in fact related to cognition, which includes perceiving, sensing, problem solving, thinking and remembering however thinking styles are different from cognitive styles in the sense that these are more general and instead of one they have many dimensions. For instance, field dependence/independence, impulsivity/reflectively etc. cognitive styles have only one dimension whereas Sternberg’s thinking styles based on multidimensions such as functions, forms, levels, scope and learning. These thinking styles are not the abilities rather they are different ways of exploring abilities for thinking intellectually or creatively.

1.2.2 Harrison and Bramson’s Model of Thinking Styles

“How do People think about things ?” Most people in sometime in their lives have asked this question. It is usually when you are thinking about some other person ideas and trying to figure out how they reached the conclusions they did. Harrison and Bramson, through their research, found that in Western society there are five distinct styles of thinking. Most people show a marked preference for one or two of the styles. These styles are referred to as “inquiry modes”. The five styles of thinking are; synthesist, idealist, pragmatist, analyst, realist.

1. **Synthesist Style**: Synthesists are apt (appropriate) to appear challenging, skeptical, or satirically amused, even when you can see no cause for any of that. Synthesists like to speculate and enjoy being the “devils advocate” synthesists are different. They tend to enjoy conflict and argument simply for the sake of argument. They tend to find solutions through combining contradictory views and insisted by reaching an agreement or compromise.

2. **Idealist Style**: Idealists look and respond attentively and receptively. Idealists gives impression that they are truly interested in what you are saying and value your opinion. From the stand point of conflict they are the exact opposite of the synthesist. They show conflict and are always trying to be
accommodating. As an idealist, they try to think holistically. Wholesomeness and assimilation are two very strong traits for an idealist. Idealist also tend to take a much longer view of things. They tend to be greater planners and are convinced that the world can be a better place if only people started thinking about the future and planning more. Idealists also tend to be very receptive listeners. They aren't interested in listening to a lot of data or facts however. They are more interested in 'people' and 'feelings'. Because of this, they can be very good at gathering information.

3. Pragmatist Style: "Pragmatists often show a good deal of humour, a quickness to agree with others' ideas. Unlike the idealist, they don't shy away from conflict but neither do they relish it like the synthesist. They realize it is useful and necessary and they make use of it. They like to experiment and brainstorm and can be very creative. The pragmatist motto appear to be 'whatever works' the workability and quick pay of their efforts. They are not ones for great, long range plans and tend to be short range, practical thinkers.

4. Analyst Style: "Analysts tend to appear cool, studious, perhaps distant and hard to read. They look at things logically and are data and fact centered. They believe in reason and rules and one correct way of doing things. They can appear very dry and disciplined, without much of a sense of humour. It's not that they don't have a sense of humour, its just that its more cerebral. Their basic strategy is one of methodology and the scientific method. If they have a task to perform, they write it down and remains systematic in this outlook on life.

5. Realist Style: Realists tend to have a direct, forceful, frank appearance, not necessarily aggressive, but sometimes that too. They are no-nonsense people. The main strategy employed by a realist is that of empirical discovery. They like things concrete and rely very much on their sense to tell them about the world.
1.2.3 Importance of Thinking Styles

The Potential contribution of thinking styles to education may be described in the following ways:

1. **Improving Instructional Methods**: Thinking styles might provide a basis for tailoring the mode of presentation as well as the nature and degree of substantive structure to functional characteristics of learners, so as to develop, compensate for or capitalize upon student characteristics for the optimization of subject matter learning, contrariwise, depending on the educational goals, students might be deliberately confronted with instructional demands that are congenial to their thinking styles so as to stimulate growth and flexibility. There is thus a continuing but potentially fruitful tension over the relative value of matching educational treatments to learner
characteristics as opposed to mismatching them. Although matching may be facilitative when the aim is to enhance immediate subject matter achievement mismatching may be needed when the aim is to promote flexible and creative thinking obstacles, opposition, conflict and challenge may be necessary to stimulate individual development and creativity. Depending upon the instructional aims, curriculum materials and procedure might be devised in stylistic terms by varying the degree of independent study versus group instruction, cognitive controls and stylistic abilities might thus serve to increase the functional options individualization of instruction.

2. **Enriching Teacher Behaviours and Conceptions**: Teacher performance might be improved through heightened awareness of thinking styles, which could lead to increased flexibility in the teacher’s own stylistic preference for particular evaluation and teaching methods. Increased teacher awareness of stylistic differences might also improve teacher student communication by increasing sensitivity to verbal and non-verbal stylistic cues and to communicative difficulties attendant upon stylistic mismatch. Teachers and students who are similar in thinking styles tend to view each other with greater mutual esteem than to those who are dissimilar; they also tend to communicate more effectively, as if they were on the same wavelength. If teachers and students were more aware of stylistic differences, these match-mismatch are considerably attenuated through resulting improved communication.

3. **Enhancing Student Learning and Thinking Strategies**: By increasing student awareness of thinking styles and their implications for learning, communication and social functioning, the teacher might expand student purviews about the range of alternative thinking strategies that are congenial to their styles but those that are uncongenial as well. Since strategies may be more easily learned than styles and more amendable to alteration, teacher might thereby increase the students strategic repertoire and the likelihood that
strategies, even stylistically uncongenial one's will be selectively and appropriately applied as a function of varied task requirements.

4. **Expanding Guidance and Vocational Decision-Making** : Since thinking styles are related to vocational preferences and to choice of major field as well as to choice of specialization and to relative performance within field, knowledge of students, thinking styles should contribute to improved educational decision making. Moreover, since thinking styles have significance's for the ways in which information is selected, processed and used, styles should be taken into account in optimizing students involvement in the guidance process.

5. **Broading Educational Goals and Outcomes** : The pervasiveness of thinking styles suggests that capitalizing upon styles and coping with their restructiveness might become explicit goals of education that schools and colleges should be concern not just with knowledge acquisition but also with the students manner of thinking. The concern invokes a number of process goals and associated process outcomes to be evaluated such as the development of strategic thinking, the enrichment of the students' repertoire of procedural alternatives and the development flexibility in the utilization of multiple thinking modes.

6. **Turning the Stylistic Demands of Learning Environment** : Educational environments make stylistic as well as intellective demands, but the stylistic demands of most current programmes and settings are usually so intermixed that they neither uniformly match nor uniformly mismatch learning styles. Rather, they are generally misaligned with stylistic characteristics of learners with some environmental and program features facilitating and others debilitating performance. This often puts students in a double bind. From the thinking style perspective, we are in a position to explore the stylistic requirements of different learning environments with a view towards developing style consistent modules of instructional method. Such modules might include suitable teaching methods. Such explorations may help to
better understand and appreciate the subtle stylistic demands of the conditions of learning.

7. **Render Help in Adopting Suitable Assessment Methods**: it is assumed that different methods of assessment tend to benefit different thinking styles. For instance, multiple choice testing is very much oriented towards executive and local thinkers. Similarly, short answer type tests are most compatible to executive, local hierarchical and internal thinking. Essay tests do not benefit particular styles, rather whom they benefit depends on how the essays are evaluated. Projects and portfolios tend to reward styles that are quite different form those typically rewarded by short answer and multiple choice tests. Even interviews tend to reward some styles over other. Therefore, there is a need to correspondence between thinking styles and different formats of tests. Having complete knowledge of testing and thinking styles, the teachers is in best position to adopt suitable methods of assessment in the classroom. Thus, it may be noted that instructor can facilitate learners use of thinking styles information for helping them to understand as thinkers, for encouraging them to expand their thinking styles for using a variety of learning approaches and for creating an environment in which diversity can thrive.

1.3 **TEACHING STYLES**

1.3.1 **The Concept of Teaching Style**

Teaching style is a unique way of teaching. Every teacher teaches the students in a characteristic way. Some authors have made attempts to clarify the concept of teaching styles. In following paragraphs views of some authors have been presented. **Eble (1983)** has linked 'style' with the 'character' and asserted that without character a teacher is ill equipped. While defining the construct of teaching style he said that it is a 'characteristic way a teacher goes about his or her work. In his opinion, 'teaching style' is a matter of both one's natural bent and consciously developed attitudes and actions. In other words, it is a inborn quality but is a subject to development.
Gregorc (1987) states that different teachers brings their own uniqueness to the way they teach, we call this teaching style.

Butler (1984) offers a comprehensive definition of teaching style in the following words: "Teaching style is a set of attitudes and actions that open a formal and attitudes and informal world of learning to students. It is a subtle force that influences students access to learning and teaching by establishing parameters around acceptable learning procedures, processes, and products. The powerful force of the teachers attitude toward students as well as the instructional activities used by the teacher shape the learning/teaching experience and require of the teacher and student certain mediation abilities and capacities. Thus, the manner in which teachers present themselves as humanbeings and receive learners as human beings is as influential upon the students lives and learning as the daily activities in the classroom".

According to Hanson (1986) a teaching style is a reflection of individual’s value system regarding human nature, and the kinds of goals and environments that enhance human learning. One’s teaching style represents a conscious or unconscious enacting of the ways one prefers to learn, and remember being taught. It is exhibited in preferred or repeated behaviors. Some teaching behaviours are naturally more comfortable for one style than for others. A teaching style tends to support a particular kind of teaching, and its related subject matter, to the general exclusion of other teaching styles and their related content. No individual displays all of the characteristics of any particular teaching style nor do the characteristics of any particular teaching style explain all of a teacher’s behaviour environmental, cultural and inherited characteristics invariably modify an individual’s behaviour.

Grasha (1994) asserts that a teaching style represent a pattern of needs, beliefs and faculty display in their classroom. Further, style is multi-dimensional and affect of how people present information, intract with students, manage classroom tasks, supervise course work, socialize students to the field and mentor students. The college teachers use some styles more often then others.
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1.3.2 Cognitive Styles, Thinking Styles and Teaching Styles

Cognitive styles broadly refer to the characteristics ways in which people perceive, think, remember, learn, process information and solve intellectual and creative problems. In simplest terms, cognition centered styles are called cognitive styles. They are different from the teaching styles. Teaching styles are the unique ways because teaching styles get manifestations in different facets of teaching viz. planning, organizing, managing, controlling and evaluation, etc. while cognitive styles rests upon mental processes. Teachers cognitive style may work on the back of his teaching style but both are distinct constructs. The former is process oriented while the latter in action oriented style. Thinking Styles referred to the manner in which one wants to prefer to use either intellective thinking or creative thinking. They are distinct from teaching styles but are intimately related to teaching styles. However, they form the class of cognitive styles.

1.3.3 Teaching Strategies and Teaching Styles

A teaching strategy is a particular set of steps to evoke from learners a specific set of desired behaviours. Teaching strategies are deliberate efforts by the teachers to vary the mode of presentation to more appropriately represent the functions (cognitive and affective) inherent in a particular learning objective. In the teaching strategies as much effect is devoted to the learner's role as to the teacher's role. In the use of the strategies, teachers and learner become a team with announced goals and clearly identified procedures for reaching those goals. Each strategy has a purpose. Thus strategy may be used single or in combination; one at a time or many at one time, depending upon the objectives. On the other hand 'teaching style' represents the way one communicates or teaches. Teaching style is a pattern of behaviour of teaching exhibited by the teacher. These may be treated personal qualities of the teacher which are manifested during classroom transactions. One teaching style is not superior to any other. One teacher may have several styles, elements, still using one style
more frequently. A teacher may possess a hierarchy of preferred teaching styles in which one or two styles may have predominance.

1.3.4 Elements of Teaching Style

According to Grasha (1996) understanding of teaching styles may be enhanced if we have a list of element of style that we can use as a basis for examining oneself. There is however, no clear consensus about common components of style. Several approaches to understand the styles of teachers appear to the literature. Various authors emphasize different aspects/facets how people teach.

Below is given the outlines of several contemporary approaches to identify the elements of teaching style:

1. **General Modes of Classroom Behaviour**: Webster's dictionary defines style as "a manner or mode of acting or performing, a distinctive or characteristic manner, or a manner or tone assumed to discourse"; thus style represents those personal qualities teachers public display.

2. **Characteristics Associated with a Popular Teacher**: popular teachers have typical characteristics that colleagues and students judge to be unique and interesting. These personal dispositions are indicative of style of popular teachers.

3. **The Teaching Method Employed**: Sometimes style is used as a method of instruction one employs in the classroom. The preferred instructional practices of someone describes his style. On this basis, a person might be labelled a 'lecturer' 'discussion leader' or perhaps 'Socratic Teacher'.

4. **Behaviours Common to all Teaching Faculty Members**: Behaviours common to all teaching faculty members are considered elements of style. These are identified largely through research or the characteristics associated with "effective teaching". The elements of style include as how teacher organizes information the clarity of presentations, enthusiasm, and their ability to develop rapport with the students. The variations among
faculty members to such behaviours become markers for identifying differences in teaching styles.

5. **The Roles Teacher Play**: The faculty plays a number of roles in teaching. These are consistent patterns of behaviour that guide and direct our thoughts and behaviours to specific situations. Teachers may assume the role of a consultant, resource person, person model, prescriptive advisor or other role. When a teacher is flexible, he is able to assume various roles to demands of particular situations.

6. **Personality Traits**: Characteristics found in a formal theory of personality are used to describe the styles of teachers or common characteristics found in faculty members through observation and or in interviews are styles. These personality traits of teachers help us to understand the differences in styles of teachers.

7. **Archetypal Forms**: Basic yet pervasive forms or models of teaching are treated as styles. All teachers are assumed to be representations of these basic forms (e.g. Teacher Centred, student centred).

8. **Metaphors for Teaching**: Analogies similar, allegories, and other forms of figurative language are employed to describe behaviours of teachers (e.g. midwife, yoda, coach, matafhors, gardener) such metaphors reflect our beliefs, attitudes and values thus constitute a personal model of teaching that teachers use to guide and direct their actions.

1.3.5 **Types of Teaching Styles**

A number of styles may be identified related to teaching. For example, **Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939)** referred to two major types of teaching styles authoritarian and democratic – **Withall (1949)** identified teacher centred and pupil-centred teaching styles. – **Flanders (1960)** recognized direct and indirect teaching styles. – **Adams (1970)** identified 14 teaching styles (i) subject matter centered (ii) interpersonal relationship centred (iii) discipline and control centred (iv) skill acquisition centred (v) fact acquisition centred (vi) understanding acquisition centred (vii) teacher dominated communications (viii) teacher pupil
communications. (ix) free communication with no teacher domination (x) allowing all students working in the same task collectively (xi) allowing different groups working on the same task (xii) allowing different groups of students working on different tasks. (xiii) style which emphasize teacher determined rules (xiv) style which emphasize student determined rules. – Gilbert (1972) identified four basic teaching styles Authoritative, benevolent, Consultative and Participative Group. – Yanoff (1973) described three styles of teaching which differed in their style of directiveness : teacher guided, small group and individual oriented teaching style. – Joseph Axelord (1973) identified two main kinds of teaching styles of university teachers viz. i) didactic and ii) evocative. The former teaching styles are employed by teacher craftsmen, and the latter by teacher artist. The didactic teaching styles stress either cognitive knowledge acquired primarily by memorization or skills acquired primarily by repetition and practices.

On the other hand, the major characteristic of evocative teaching styles is that inquiry and discovery on the part of the student, which is required or encouraged for the successful completion of the learning tasks set by the teacher.

Clingnet (1974) referred two teaching styles which are opposed to each other. They are assimilation teaching style and accommodation teaching style.

Bennett (1975) extracted 12 teacher types or teaching styles at primary school level through factor analysis. Teacher type-I/Teaching style-I, Teacher type-II/ Teaching style-II, Teacher type-III/Teaching style-III Teacher type-IV/Teaching style-IV, Teacher Type-V/Teaching style-V, Teacher type-VI/ Teaching style-VI, Teacher type-VII/ Teaching style-VII, Teacher type-VIII/ Teaching style-VIII, Teacher type-IX/ Teaching style-IX, Teacher type-X/ Teaching style-X, Teacher type-XI/ Teaching style-XI, Teacher type-XII/ Teaching style-XII.

Bennett (1976) while discussing a typology of teaching styles, reported two teaching styles of school teachers namely progressive and traditional. These were differentiated on the basis of teaching behaviours involved. Traditional
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teaching was characterized by separate subject matter, teachers as distributor of knowledge, passive pupil role, pupils have no say in curriculum planning, accent on memory, practice and role, external rewards, concerned with academic standards, regular testing, emphasis on competition, teaching confined to classroom base, little emphasis on creative expression.

Contrary to this progressive teaching style was characterized by integrated subject matter, teacher as guide to educational experiences, active pupil role, pupils participation in curriculum planning, learning predominantly by discovery techniques, external rewards and punishments, external rewards and punishments not necessary, not too concerned with academic standards, little testing, accent on cooperative group work, teaching not confined to classroom base, and accent on creative expression. These styles have also been referred to as formal and non-formal or closed and open teaching styles.

**Eggleston, Galton and Jones (1976)** analyzed a typology of three teaching styles in science. These are described as under: the problem solver, the informer, inquirer.

**Fischer and Fischer (1979)** described six teaching styles (i) the task oriented (ii) the cooperative planner, (iii) the child centered (iv) the subject centered (v) the learning centered, and (vi) the emotionally exciting.

**Camfield (1980)** identified four teaching styles namely. Information processing style social interaction style, behavior modification style and personal sources based style Sarlak (1983) identified two basic styles of teaching: operative or authoritative style, cooperative or democratic style.

**Henson and Borthwick (1984)** have suggested six different style of teaching: task oriented approach, cooperative planner, child centered approach, subject centered approach, learning centered approach, emotionally exciting approach.

**Spear and Sternberg (1987)** enlisted three distinct teaching styles: (i) didactic (lecture based (ii) fact based questioning, and (iii) dialogical (thinking based questioning).
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Smith (1988) identified two basic styles: (i) Individualized, and (ii) Traditional learning style.

Zahorik (1991) based on his study found three major types of teaching styles—coverage, extension, and thinking.

1.3.6 Grasha's Model of Teaching

Grasha (1996) identified five teaching styles which have been described below:

1. **Expert**: Teacher with this style possesses knowledge and expertise that students need. He strives to maintain status as an expert among students by displaying detailed knowledge and by challenging students to enhance their competence, feels concerned with transmitting information and insuring that students are well prepared.

2. **Formal Authority Style**: Teacher with this style possesses status among students because of knowledge and role as a faculty member. He feels concerned with providing positive and negative feedback, establishing learning goals and rules of conduct for students. He has concern with the correct acceptable and standard way to do things and with providing students with the structure they need to learn.

3. **Personal Model Style**: Teacher with this style believes in teaching by personal examples and establishes a prototype for how to think and behave. He oversees, guides, and directs by showing how to do things, and encouraging students to observe and emulate the instructors approach.

4. **Facilitator Style**: Teacher with this style emphasizes the personal nature of teacher-student-interaction. He guides and directs students by asking questions, exploring options, suggesting alternatives, and encouraging them to develop criteria to make informed choices. The overall goal of teaching is to develop in students the capacity for independent action, initiative, and responsibility. He works with students on projects in a consultative fashion and tries to provide as much as support and encouragement as possible.
5. **Delegator Style**: Teacher with this style is concerned with developing students' capacity to function in an autonomous fashion. Students work independently on projects or as part of autonomous teams. The teachers are available at the request of students as a resource person. A teacher may have one teaching style as most dominating and other style as less dominating. Thus a teacher may exhibit a profile of various teaching styles.

**Figure 1.3**: Shows Five Teaching Styles According to Grasha Model of Teaching Style

1.3.7 **Antecedents of Teaching Styles**

It has been acknowledged that teaching style interacts with several important variables. First of all is the teacher personality. It may be found to have close link with teaching style.
Another factor affecting the selection of a teaching style is the **nature of the subject matter**. Certain subjects, or certain levels of a subject may lead themselves more to one style than to another.

Apart from the above mentioned factors, **gender** of a teacher seems to be relevant to the preference of teaching style. Since males and females are socialized to different ways, differences to acceptable behaviours and styles are likely to occur. **Sternberg (1997)** believed that difference in styles are likely to be rewarded for males versus females.

**Grasha (1994)** addressed a question to 560 college teachers who come in his various workshops and seminars: what influences your teaching style? They frequently listed the following items:

1. **The nature of the course** (required/not required; major/non-major) and size of the class;
2. **The subject matter** (hard science versus humanities);
3. **Level of the students** (freemen, seniors, graduate);
4. **How much they liked the class**;
5. **Time pressure**;
6. **Need to prepare students for standard exams**;
7. **Information about alternative ways to teach willingness to take risks**;
8. **Not wanting to deviate from department and college norms for teaching**.

In addition to the above, **self-concept** of a teacher and **his philosophy** of concept of teaching and learning are some of the important determinants of teaching.

**1.3.8 Importance of Teaching Styles**

Teaching is a complex interaction of many skills. The effectiveness of a teacher, therefore, depends upon the various skills he employs. In other words, teacher effectiveness depends upon his teaching style.

An understanding of teaching style is important because without it teacher can neither be assessed nor trained.
It is imperative to realize that many combinations of teaching styles may be equally effective, although others may be less so. Thus at the time of assessment or training of teachers although some teaching styles need to be discouraged, there is no one teaching style which is better than all the rest.

If a teacher is to practice his own teaching style, a high degree of self understanding is necessary. Further, it is fairly obvious that if different teachers have different styles, students will need to adopt different learning strategies with different teachers.

**According to Schultz (1982)** the construct of teaching style has been found very crucial in relation to student performance. He further highlighted that the teacher exhibiting different teaching style attempt to create classroom social psychological climates consonant with their teaching style.

**Guild and Garger (1985)** state that the personal and professional experiences of educators provide constant evidence that the style differences do exist and they affect many aspects of being teaching process.

**Gregorc (1987)** while pointing out the significance of teaching style said that teaching style governs the reality of classroom. Teaching styles become important especially in the light of the fact that different learners will respond differently to different styles of teaching. What works well for one learner may not work well for another *(Sternberg, 1997)*.

**According to Spear and Sternberg (1987)** one reason for why teaching style is important is that by adopting a certain style, teacher models a certain role for students.

They further state that each style has a place in teaching. Rather than relying exclusively on one style, teachers need to develop skill at using a variety of styles and should select a given style depending on what works best to particular teaching situation.

**Bennett (1988)** pointed out that certain teaching styles are related to engender increased progress in students learning outcomes and gains in pupil
motivation and attitudes toward learning. Thus teaching style assume a greater significance in contest of at school and college level teaching.

**Grasha (1994)** held that teaching style affect how teachers present information, interact with students, manage classroom tasks, supervise course work, socialize students to the field and mentor students. In fact teaching style affects learning styles of the students as well as what transpires in the classroom. He concluded that teaching in college classroom appears to be matter of style.

**Sternberg (1994)** concluded that student in fact receive higher grades and more favourable evaluations when their styles are closely matched those of their teachers.

**Grasha (1996)** expressed that stylistic patterns are critical not only to understand what is happening to the classroom but to help us see what could be occurring. Information about the styles of teachers and learners become an essential ingredient to our conceptual base for teaching.

Thus, it is clear from the foregoing discussion that teaching styles are not only important for teachers to make teaching learning process effective but also important for administrators to assess the teachers and train them. They are also helpful to learners to adopt different learning styles and strategies with different teachers. They are also important for course designers and text book writers.

Staff developers can make use of this notion of teaching styles to improve classroom teaching. Obviously they can discuss the various teaching styles with teachers and administration, give examples of various styles, and talk about when it is appropriate to use which style.

### 1.4 SELF-ESTEEM

#### 1.4.1 The Concept of Self-Esteem

What is Self-esteem? It is difficult to define. Self-concept, ideal self and self-image etc. terms prevalent in the literature create great confusion with regard to the exact meaning of the term self-esteem. **English and English (1958)** identify over a thousand different combinations and uses of the terms in the area
of self-concept. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the concept of self-esteem by clarifying the related terms.

The term "Self-concept" may be defined as the sum total of an individual mental and physical characteristics, it has three aspects; the cognitive (thinking) the affective (feeling) and behavioral (action). Self-concept is the umbrella term under whom; self-image, ideal-self ad self-esteem develop. The self-image is the individual’s awareness of his or her own self. It an awareness of ones own identity. The self-concept and its relation with other three terms referred to as above, have been depicted in the following figure:

```
Self-Concept
  ↓
Self-image (What a person is like to be)
  ↓
Ideal-self (What a person would)
  ↓
Self-esteem (What a person feels about the discrepancy what he/she is/what he/she would like to be)
```

**Self-Image**

Self-image is the individual’s awareness of his/her mental and physical characteristics. The earliest impressions of self-image are mainly concepts of body image. With cognitive development, more refined physical and mental skill become possible. It is a starting point for an understanding of self-esteem.

**Ideal-Self**

Side by side with the development of self-image the child is learning that there are ideal characteristics he/she should possess—that these are ideal standards of behaviour and also particular skills, which are valued. The school
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child is most likely to be at the stages of accepting these ideal images from the significant people around his /her and of striving to a greater or lesser degree to attain them.

**Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem is the individual’s evaluation of the discrepancy between self-image and ideal self. It is an affective process and it is a measure of the extent to which the individual cares about this discrepancy. The child with high self-esteem is likely to be confident in social situation and in tackling line school works. He /she will have attained a natural curiosity for learning and will be eager and enthusiastic when presented with a new challenge. The child with low self-esteem, in contrast will lack confidence in his/her ability to succeed. Consequently, he /she may try to avoid situations, which he/she sees as potentially personally humiliating.

**The Self-Esteem Hierarchy**

The question often poses is can we have low self-esteem in one situation and high self-esteem in another? According to Shavelson at al. (1976), This is asked only by those who have not understood the hierarchical nature of self-esteem. Self-esteem is defined so far refers to "global self-esteem" and individuals overall feeling of self-worth. This is relatively stable and consistent overtime.

In addition to this overall, or global, self-esteem we can have feeling of worth or unworthiness in specific situation. Accordingly, we may feel inadequate (low self-esteem) with regard to mathematics or tennis playing. However, they do not affect our overall feeling of self-worth as we can escape their influences by avoiding those situations. If, of course, we cannot avoid them and regularly participate in these activities, which make us feel inadequate, they may eventually affect our overall self-esteem. Also if we continue to fail in areas which are valued by the significant people in our lives overall self-esteem is affected. Shavelson and Bolus (1982) have given following hierarchy of self-esteem;
1.4.2 Importance of Self-Esteem

One of the most exciting discoveries in educational psychology in recent times has been the finding that peoples level of achievement are influenced by how they feel about themselves. A vast body of research evidence has accumulated showing a positive correlation between self-esteem and achievement, and with regard to self-esteem and school achievement in particular.

Perhaps even more exciting has been the practical implications of research on self-esteem for the classroom teacher. The teacher is in a powerful position to be able to influence a students self-esteem not only through the use of systematic activities but also through the establishment of particular caring relationships with students. The work of humanist school psychology has focussed on certain ingredients of personality which are instrumental in the latter. There is a clear evidence that relationships between teacher and students can be either conducive to the enhancement or self-esteem conducive towards reducing self-esteem. Whenever the teacher enters into a relationship with a students a process is set into motion which results either in the enhancement of self-esteem or in the reduction of self-esteem. Moreover, this process occurs whether the teacher is aware of it or not. While some teachers may intuitively enhance the self-esteem of their students; the evidence is that all teachers might will benefit from an awareness of the principle involved in self-esteem enhancement.
The teaching becomes more effective when the teacher is able to combine an approach, which focuses not only on the development of skills but also in the student's effective state, and a self-esteem in particular. Successful teachers have always combined the behavioural with the affective approach.

1.5 JOB-SATISFACTION

1.5.1 Concept of Job-Satisfaction

The term “job satisfaction” has been used in a variety of ways. Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotion state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experiences. Job satisfaction is related to, but distinguishable from morale and job involvement since a job is not an entity or a physical things, but a complex of interrelationship of likes roles, responsibilities, interactions incentives and rewards. Job satisfaction has to be intimately related to all of them.

Job satisfaction in fact, refers to the satisfaction of a worker in his work. It is a source of satisfaction physical, psychological and social needs of an individuals in his work. Work occupies an important place in the life of a person. According to Vroom (1964) there two types of conditions-economic and motivational under which people work. Stating why people work he has listed five properties of work roles: (1) financial remuneration (2) expenditure of energy (3) production of goods and services (4) social interaction and (5) effects on social status of a workder. It is evident that work provides many sources of satisfaction.

According to Maslow (1954) there is a hierarchy in the basic human needs the physiological needs forming the basis of hierarchy. The physiological needs are most important of all needs. When one gets satisfaction of his physiological needs, he craves for the gratification of other needs in the sequence like. Safety, love, esteem and self-actualization. Thus satisfaction of job results through the gratification of such needs.

Herzberg et al. (1962) conducted a study of job-motivation. They divided the wants of workers into two groups. One group revolves around the need to develop in one's occupation as a source of personal growth. Among them are the
needs like feeling of recognition, achievements, growth responsibility, interests, increased or decreased status security etc. These are called satifiers or motivators. These are intrinsic factors whose presence gives satisfaction. The other group operates as an essential base to the first and is associated with fair treatment in compensation, supervision, working conditions, administrative practices. Job-security etc. these are called hygiene or 'extrinsic' factors. These are preventive and environment in nature. Their presence does not add to the satisfaction of such needs, prevents dissatisfaction and poor job performance. This new factor theory Herzberg et al. provoked considerable interest in testing it further since 1959, both in India and outside some studies supported it while others have not.

Job satisfaction as a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas viz. Specific job-factors, individual characteristics and group relationship outside the job.

From the above discussion it becomes clear that job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes the employees holds towards his job related factors, and also life in general.

1.5.2 Dimensions of Job

Rao (1986) has listed the following dimensions of job which may be considered important, among others-work, pay, promotions, recognition, benefits, working conditions, supervision, co-workers, and management policy.

The process theories of job satisfaction consider the above job dimensions not only casually relevant, but also how they combine to determine overall job-satisfaction.

1.5.3 Theories of Job-Satisfaction

Here an attempt has been made to give a brief discussion of the available theories of job satisfaction that will satisfy the demand for the article understanding of job-satisfaction and will guide the discussion and interpretation of the results. A theory of job satisfaction, infact is the theoretical and systematic explanation of job-satisfaction. These are following major theories of job
satisfaction which have served as either implicit or explicit reference points for much of the research in this area.

(i) **Conventional Theory**: conventionally job satisfaction has been interpreted as an unidimensional concept. This approach explains job satisfaction as the total body of feelings an individual has about his job, this feeling being made up of both related and environment related factors, the interaction of which causes fluctuation between a condition of satisfaction and of dissatisfaction. Midway between satisfaction, or positive feelings about the job, dissatisfaction, all negative feeling about the job, is a condition of neutrality, in which individual is neither satisfied no dissatisfied. Dissatisfaction is this opposite of satisfaction. If an individual is deprived of any factor combination of them, such as pay, satisfactory interpersonal relations, responsibility, advancement, good working conditions, or any of many others, he moves towards the negative end of the continuum, unless the presence of other factors counter balances the lack. Adding or improving a factor or combination of them causes movement in a positive direction. Some factors affect the distance moved more than others do, but there is no agreement on their order of importance. This according to conventional view of job satisfaction, satisfaction and dissatisfaction represent terminal points on a linear continuum. This view is also called as unifactor or bipolar theory.

(ii) **Two factor theory**: two factor theory of job satisfaction was the first significant steps towards a multidimensional description of job satisfaction. In contrast to the conventional unifactor approach, Herzberg and his associated (1959) presented job satisfaction as a dichotomous variable rather than a continuous variable. In their study of engineers and accountants, they viewed satisfaction as resulting form motivation, stemming in the challenge of job through such factor as achievement, responsibility growth, advancement, work it self, and earned recognition. They observed that dissatisfaction springs from factors peripheral to the task. Thus they concluded that only Intrinsic work elements called satisfiers
or motivators could generate job-satisfaction. Conversely, extrinsic elements called dissatisfiers or hygiene's gave rise to job dissatisfaction. The roles of satisfiers and dissatisfiers were seen as independent a satisfiers could not evoke dissatisfiers could a dissatifiers give rise to job satisfaction. According to this theory, sahsfiers may range upward form neutrality (an indifference point in terms of satisfaction). But do not serve as sources of job dissatisfaction. Dissatisfiers, conversely, may range downward from neutrality but do not serve as source of job satisfaction. And this, job satisfaction is made up of two unipolar traits. This theory in also refereed as Dual factor theory or Motivation-Maintenance theory.

(iii) Expectancy Theory: Vroom (1978) has proposed a cognitive model of motivation which attempts to explain satisfaction in the job. The Key variable in Vroom's model of valence. Valence refers to affective orientation towards particular outcomes and outcomes can be positive or negative in valence. If an outcome has positive valence, this means that an individual would like to achieve it, while an outcome with negative valence is one that person prefers not to attain. Vroom hypothesized that the valence of a job to a person performing it is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valence of all other outcomes and his conceptions of the instrumentality of the job for the attainment of those other outcomes. He says that there are considerable evidences indicating that persons: reports of the attractiveness of their jobs (i.e. the extent of their job satisfaction) are directly related to the extent to which their jobs are instrumental to the attainment of outcomes which might be assumed to be generally attractive to persons.

(iv) Reference Theory: As an alternative to the theoretical formulation of job satisfaction, Smith (1963) proposes that job satisfaction is a function of the perceived characteristics of a job in relation to an individual's frame of reference. A particular job condition, on the basis of their theoretical position, can be a satisfier, disatisfier, or irrelevant depending on condition in
comparable jobs, conditions of other people of the same qualifications and past experiences as the individual, as well as on numerous situational variables of the present job. Thus according to this view, job satisfaction is not an absolute phenomenon but is relative to the alternatives available to the individual.

(v) **Need Fulfillment Theory** : Need fulfillment theory of job satisfaction is that a) a person is satisfied if he gets what he wants, and b) the more he wants something, or the more important it is to him, the more satisfied he is when he gets it and the more dissatisfied he is when he does not get it. There are the models that utilize this kind of framework, one is subtractive model and the other multiplicative model. But both conceptualize job satisfaction as a direct function of the extent to which an environment corresponds to one's need structures.

The subtractive model propose job satisfaction is a direct negative function of the discrepancy between a persons needs and the extent to which the environment provides satisfaction of those needs. On the other hand, multiplicative model proposes that the job satisfaction is a function of the multiplication of a persons needs and the degree to which the job fulfils those needs. There are several studies that supports these models.

(vi) **Reference Group Theory** : Reference-group (Smith, 1963) theory is similar to need fulfillment theory except that it takes as its points of departure not the needs of the individual but, rather, the point of view and the opinions of the group to whom the individual looks for guidance. Such groups are defined as the reference group for the individual in that they defined the way in which he should look at the work and evaluate various phenomenon in the environment. It can be predicted, according to this theory, the job satisfaction is a function of, or is positively related to, the degree to which the characteristics of the job meet with the approval and the desires of the groups to which the individual looks for guidance in evaluating the world and
defining social reality. There are several studies available that support this view of job satisfaction.

(vii) Need Gratification Theory: Need gratification theory has been proposed as an alternative to the two factor theory of job satisfaction by Wolf (1970). In this theory, Wolf introduces the consideration of the individuals psychological needs (Maslow, 1954) and their influence on the relationship between job elements and satisfaction. Job motivation can be considered as a sub classification of general motivation; as such it follows the principles of need hierarchy. The individual actively seeks to gratify his active need or needs, essentially ignoring both lower level needs that are already gratified and higher level needs that have not yet emerged. Dissatisfaction results either from the frustration of the gratification of an active need or from an interruption or threatened interruption to the continued gratification of previously gratified (lower level) needs. Satisfaction results from the gratification of any need; however, satisfaction is greater when a previously ungratified need is gratified than when a previously gratified need is gratified on as an on-going basis.

According to this theory both context and content elements can serve as both satisfiers and dissatisfiers. For persons whose lower level needs are largely gratified and whose higher level needs are active, context elements will be essentially unrelated to increased satisfaction since the associated needs have been gratified an on-going basis. Context elements will be strongly related to decreased satisfaction for such persons, however, when the level of on-going gratification of the related lower level needs is threatened. For these persons, content elements will be strongly related to both increased and decreased satisfaction, the level of satisfaction fluctuating directly with the degree to which the related higher level needs are gratified.

1.5.4 Importance of Job-Satisfaction for a Teacher

A teacher is a ‘Key’ to reform, change and success of any educational programme. Without his willingness, commitment and involvement nothing
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tangible can be achieved in formal schooling, collegiate or higher education. If he feels satisfied with his job, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching learning system is enhanced to a great extent. If he feels dissatisfied with his job, no amount of pressure or control exercised by the administrators or educational managers can made him to work. There is old saying that you can take the horse to the pond, but you can not force him to drink the water. Unless a teacher feels internally motivated, learning goals cannot be achieved. Learner’s development cannot take place with reference to their cognitive development. Satisfaction with job has a vital link with one’s efficacy and efficiency of the institution.

1.6 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since the thinking and teaching styles in higher education have not been adequately studied in relation to their self-esteem, job-satisfaction, gender, age, stream, teaching experience, academic qualifications and nature of appointment, the following research questions were specifically addressed in the present study:

1. Are thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators related to self-esteem?
2. Are thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators related to job-satisfaction?
3. Does gender of teacher educators significantly influences their thinking and teaching styles?
4. Does age of teacher educators significantly influences their thinking and teaching styles?
5. Are there significant differences in thinking and teaching styles of science and arts teacher educators?
6. Does variation in teaching experience significantly influence thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators?
7. Does academic qualifications of teacher educators significantly influence their thinking and teaching styles?
8. Are there significant difference exist in thinking and teaching styles of regular and adhoc teacher educators?
In view of the above mentioned research questions the proposed study was stated as under:

**A STUDY OF THINKING AND TEACHING STYLES OF TEACHER EDUCATORS IN RELATION TO SOME SELECTED VARIABLES**

1.7 NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The effectiveness of schools depends largely on its teachers and development of teachers' effectiveness rests upon the teaching learning programme of teacher education. The key to success of teacher education is undoubtedly the teacher educators. His personality, intelligence, creativity, thinking, teaching, mastery over the subject and teaching technology determine the quality of teacher education.

Like learning style, area of thinking and teaching styles has drawn serious and considerable attention of the researchers all over the world. The research evidences have clearly demonstrated that thinking and teaching styles of the teachers have great impact on their classroom transactions with students and learning outcomes of teaching. They affect how teachers present information, interact with the students, manage classroom tasks, supervise course work, socialize students to the field and mentor students.

Learning styles of the students and teachers were only one-half of the teacher base students, interaction. The thinking and teaching styles and their effects on the learning styles of students and upon what transpired in the classroom were unfortunately missing from the literature. Recently the study of teaching and thinking styles of teachers at school college and university level has started gaining momentum.

Review of the research literature given in the ensuring chapter makes it clear that in India research on thinking and teaching styles is in its infancy stage. No, systematic attempt has been made so far by any researcher to investigate thinking and teaching styles of college and university teachers by employing
standardized inventory of thinking and teaching styles. Therefore, the existing gap in the research in higher education may be filled up by planning and undertaking research studies in this area. The investigator is of the opinion that by conducting the present study new and meaningful information pertaining to thinking and teaching styles of teachers at higher education level will emerged out which may give the new direction in the area of improvement of teaching learning process and designing programmes for teachers. Thus, the findings of the present study would be quite useful to the teaching administrators, teachers educators and in-service programme designers in seeking insights into the domain of thinking and teaching styles.

1.8 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following objectives were formulated for the study:

1. To investigate thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to self-esteem.
2. To study thinking and teaching styles of educators in relation to job-satisfaction.
3. To inquire into thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to gender.
4. To probe into the thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to age.
5. To investigate into thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to stream.
6. To inquire into thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to teaching experience.
7. To study thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to academic qualifications.
8. To study probe into thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators in relation to nature of appointment.
9. To study the nexus between thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators.
1.9 HYPOTHESES

The following research hypotheses were framed for testing:

1. There will be significant differences in thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators having high, average and low levels of self-esteem.
2. Teacher educators with high, moderate and low levels of job-satisfaction will show marked differences in their thinking and teaching styles.
3. There will be significant gender differences in thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators.
4. Teacher educators in varying age range will exhibit significant differences in their thinking and teaching styles.
5. There will be significant differences in thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators belonging to science and arts stream.
6. Teacher educator's thinking and teaching styles shall differ significantly by the varying magnitude of teaching experience.
7. There shall be marked differences in thinking and teaching styles of teachers educators with prescribed and less than prescribed academic qualifications.
8. Teacher educators appointed on regular basis and adhoc basis will show marked differences in their thinking and teaching styles.
9. There will significant associations between thinking and teaching styles of teacher educators.

1.10 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study was delimited in terms of the following ways:

1. The study was restricted to the male and female teacher educators working in colleges of education.
2. The investigation was carried out on a sample of 185 teacher educators.
3. The subjects were drawn from both science and arts streams.
4. The subjects belonged to regular and adhoc backgrounds.
5. The study was confined to colleges of education falling in the jurisdiction of H.P. University.
6. The objectives of the study were confined to the investigation of thinking and teaching styles only.

7. Research hypotheses were restricted to non-directional type.

8. Study was also confined with regard to variables. Thinking styles and teaching styles were dependent/criterion variables; and self-esteem, job satisfaction, gender, age, stream, teaching experience, academic qualifications and nature of appointment were independent variables.

9. The study was also delimited with reference to tools. Hindi adaptation of Inquiry mode questionnaire (by Harison and Bramson), English adaptation of Teaching Style Inventory (by Grasha), Self-Esteem Inventory (by Rosenberg) and Hindi adaptation of Job-Satisfaction (by Bradfield and Rothe) were used for data collection.

10. Selection of the institutions as well as subjects was done by random method.

11. The study was delimited in terms of statistical analysis techniques also. One-way-analysis of variance and ‘t’ test were used to analyze the obtained data. Pearson ‘r’ was also employed to find out the co-efficient of correlation between thinking and teaching styles. Graphic techniques was used to depict the significant differences in mean scores of various groups on criterion variables.

12. The results were confined to the delimitaions of the study already described. Also the present study was delimited in term of time and resources.

1.11 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

The terms used in the present study having different connotations may be operationally defined as under:

**Thinking styles**: refer to 5 thinking styles as measured by Harrison and Bramson’s inquiry mode questionnaire.

**Teaching Styles**: refer to 5 teaching styles as measured by Grasha’s Teaching Styles Inventory.

**Teacher Educators**: refer to Teachers of B.Ed. Colleges.

**Selected Variables**: refer to self-esteem, job-satisfaction, gender, age, stream, teaching experience, academic qualifications, and nature of appointment.