CHAPTER-V
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

Major Findings
Educational Implications of Findings
Suggestions for Further Researches
CHAPTER-V

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study focuses to explore computer use, computer anxiety, computer attitude and computer self-efficacy among the teacher educators and prospective teachers. To fulfill the objectives of the study, computer use scale, computer anxiety scale, computer attitude scale and computer self-efficacy scale were employed to collect desirable data. The collected data is analyzed with the help of mean, standard deviation, frequency, t-test, chi square test and variance of analysis in relation to various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender, discipline and socio-economic status. The findings of the study are given below:

5.1 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. Out of 150 teacher educators, 76 female teacher educators reported that they use computers for 2 hrs and less in a day whereas only 06 and 05 female teacher educators reported that they computers for 3-5 hrs and 6 hrs and more in a day respectively. As far as male teacher educators are concerned, 49 male teacher educators admitted that they use computer for 2 hrs and less in a day whereas 10 and 04 male teacher educators admitted that they use computer for 3-5 hrs and 6 hrs and more in a day respectively.

2. Out of 150 teacher educators, 68 and 57 teacher educators of both disciplines i.e. humanities and science use computers for 2 hrs and less in a day respectively. Only few teacher educators of humanities and science disciplines i.e. 09 and 06 use computers for 3-5 hrs in a day respectively whereas 06 and 04 few teacher educators of humanities and science disciplines reported that they use computers for 6 hrs and more in a day.

3. Out of 150 teacher educators, 99 teacher educators of lower income group use computer in a day for 2 hrs and less whereas only 26 teacher educators of middle income group use computer in a day for 2 hrs and less. Only 10 and 06 teacher educators of lower income group use computer for 3-5 hrs and 6 hrs and more in day respectively while only 05 and 04 06 teacher educators of middle income group use computer for 3-5 hrs and 6 hrs and more in day respectively.
4. About 83.33 percent teacher educators use computer at least for 2 hrs and less in a day whereas only 10.66 percent and 6.0 percent teacher educators use computers for 3-5 hrs and 6 hrs & more in a day respectively.

5. About 70 percent teacher educators had their own computers at home and 68.7 percent teacher educators have internet access at home. Further it is concluded that 73.3 percent teacher educators had access to computers at college while 31.3 percent teacher educators reported that their college is equipped with Wi-Fi facility.

6. About 74 percent teacher educators were daily computer users whereas 26 percent teacher educators reported that they did not use computer.

7. About 92.7 percent teacher educators reported that they use internet for searching and download of the study material, 92.7 percent use computer in leisure time, 89.3 percent use social networking sites, 83.3 percent use e-mail account to share information with colleagues, 76 percent use computer for writing a letter, application, report or lesson plan, 64 percent use online banking to manage bank accounts, 62.7 percent use computer to search online job opportunities, 58 percent use computer for online shopping and read e-magazine, e-book, e-newspaper, 57.3 percent use computer to play games, 46 percent use computer to make financial transaction, only 38.7 percent and 37.3 percent teacher educators reported the use of computers in classroom practices and use of digital libraries respectively.

8. About 14 (9.33 percent) out of 150 teacher educators had shown high computer anxiety whereas highest 92 (61.33 percent) and 44 (29.34 percent) teacher educators had exhibited low and moderate computer anxiety.

9. About 136 (90.67 percent) out of 150 teacher educators had favorable computer attitude, 13 (8.66 percent) had neutral attitude towards computer, but negligible i.e. only 01 (0.67 percent) had unfavorable attitude towards computer.

10. About 69 (46.0 percent) teacher educators had higher level of computer self-efficacy, 56 (37.33 percent) teacher educators had moderate level of computer self-efficacy and 25 (16.67 percent) teacher educators had lower level of computer self-efficacy.

11. No significant difference was found between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers with respect to daily computer use.
12. There was no significant difference observed between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers with respect to daily computer use.

13. No significant difference was found between prospective teachers of middle class socio economic status and prospective teachers of lower class socio economic status with respect to daily computer use.

14. Out of 150 prospective teachers, maximum i.e. 79 female prospective teachers and 54 male prospective teachers use computer daily for 2 hrs and less respectively. Only few i.e. 06 and 09 female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers reported that they use computer daily for 3-5 hrs daily respectively.

15. Out of 150 prospective teachers, 67 prospective teachers of science discipline and 66 prospective teachers of humanities discipline use computers daily for 2 hrs and less; 04 prospective teachers of science discipline and 10 prospective teachers of humanities discipline use computers daily for 3-5 hrs whereas only 02 prospective teachers of science discipline and 01 prospective teacher of humanities discipline use computers daily for 6 hrs and more respectively.

16. Out of 150 prospective teachers, 18 prospective teachers belong to lower income group and 15 prospective teachers belong to middle income group use computers daily for 2 hrs and less. On the other hand, 13 prospective teachers belong to lower income group and 02 prospective teachers belong to middle income group use computers daily for 3-5 hrs daily.

17. About (88.66 percent) prospective teachers reported that they spend 2 hours or less than two hours a day on computer, 10 percent prospective teachers spend 3-5 hours a day and only few i.e. 1.33 percent prospective teachers spend 6 hours or more a day on computer.

18. About (72.7 percent) and (71.3 percent) prospective teachers had their own computers and internet access at home respectively. 45.3 percent prospective teachers revealed that they had access to computers at college. Only 35.3 percent prospective teachers reported that their college provided Wi-Fi facility in campus.

19. About 60.2 percent of prospective teachers revealed that they use computer daily whereas 39.8 percent prospective teachers reported that they did not use computer daily.
20. About 86.7 percent teacher educators reported that they use internet for searching and download of the study material, 85.3 percent use social networking sites, 69.3 percent use for online shopping, 58.7 percent play games on computer, 56 percent read e-magazine, e-book, e-newspaper etc., 54.7 percent use computer in leisure time, 44.7 percent use e-mail account to share information with colleagues, 40 percent use for writing a letter, application, report or lesson plan, 24 percent use computer for online banking to manage bank accounts, 20.7 percent use internet for making financial transaction (20.7 percent), 12.7 percent use digital libraries and only 1.3 percent use computer in daily classroom practices.

21. About 86 (57.33 percent) prospective teachers had shown lower level of computer anxiety followed by 47 (31.33 percent) and 17 (11.34 percent) with moderate and high level of computer anxiety respectively.

22. About 78 (52.0 percent) prospective teachers exhibited favorable computer attitude, 55 (36.67 percent) prospective teachers remained neutral but few i.e. 17 (11.33 percent) prospective teachers shown unfavorable computer attitude.

23. About 63 (42.0 percent) prospective teachers had higher level of computer self-efficacy, 48 (32.00 percent) prospective teachers had moderate level of computer self-efficacy and 39 (26.00 percent) prospective teachers had lower level of computer self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis-1:** The first null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio-economic status in respect to their computer anxiety is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

1.1 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.2 No significant difference was found between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.3 A significant difference was found between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.
1.4 There was a significant difference between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.5 A significant difference was found between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on computer anxiety scale.

1.6 There exist no significant difference between teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.7 There was no significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.8 There exist significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.9 A significant difference was observed between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.10 There was no significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on computer anxiety scale.

1.11 There exist no significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.12 There was no significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.13 There was no significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.14 There exist significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.

1.15 There was no significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on computer anxiety scale.
Hypothesis-2: The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of teacher educators formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer anxiety is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

2.1 There was significant difference between male teacher educators and female teacher educators on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale. Female teacher educators had higher computer anxiety on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale as compare to male teacher educators.

2.2 No significant difference was found between male teacher educators and female teacher educators on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.3 There was no significant difference between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.4 There was significant difference between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale. Female teacher educators had higher computer anxiety on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale than male teacher educators.

2.5 A significant difference was found between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on computer anxiety scale. Female teacher educators possessed higher computer anxiety than male teacher educators.

2.6 There was no significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.7 No significant difference was found between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.8 There was significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale. Humanities discipline teacher educators had higher computer anxiety as compare to science discipline teacher educators.

2.9 A significant difference was found between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale. Humanities discipline teacher educators had higher computer anxiety as compare to science discipline teacher educators.
2.10 There was no significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on computer anxiety scale.

2.11 There was no significant difference between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.12 No significant difference was found between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.13 There was no significant difference between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.14 No significant difference was found between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.

2.15 There was no significant difference between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on computer anxiety scale.

**Hypothesis-3:** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of prospective teachers formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer anxiety is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

3.1 There was no significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.2 There was no significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.3 Female prospective teachers had more computer anxiety in comparison to male prospective teachers on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.4 There was significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale. Female prospective teachers had more computer anxiety in comparison to male prospective teachers on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.5 There was no significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on computer anxiety scale.
3.6 No significant difference was found between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.7 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.8 No significant difference was found between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.9 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.10 No significant difference was concluded between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on computer anxiety scale.

3.11 There was significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale. It is concluded that prospective teachers of lower class socio economic status possess higher computer anxiety on individual failure dimension of computer anxiety scale than prospective teachers of middle class socio economic status.

3.12 There was significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale. It is concluded that prospective teachers of lower class socio economic status possessed higher computer anxiety on perception dimension of computer anxiety scale as compare to prospective teachers of middle class socio economic status.

3.13 No significant difference was found between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on social aspect dimension of computer anxiety scale.

3.14 There was no significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on dilemma dimension of computer anxiety scale.
3.15 There was significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on computer anxiety scale. It is concluded that prospective teachers of lower class socio economic status possessed higher computer anxiety as compare to prospective teachers of middle class socio economic.

**Hypothesis-4:** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer attitude is fully rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

4.1 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.2 A significant difference was found between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.3 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.4 A significant difference was found between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on computer attitude scale.

4.5 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.6 There was significant difference between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.7 A significant difference was found between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.8 There was significant difference between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on computer attitude scale.

4.9 There was significant difference between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.
4.10 There was significant difference between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio economic status on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.11 A significant difference was found between different groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

4.12 There was significant difference exist between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on computer attitude scale.

**Hypothesis-5:** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of teacher educators formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer attitude is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

5.1 The male teacher educators had more favorable attitude than female teacher educators on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.2 There was significant difference between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale. The female teacher educators have more favorable attitude than male teacher educators on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.3 There was no significant difference between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.4 No significant difference was found between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on computer attitude scale.

5.5 There was no significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.6 There was no significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.7 There was no significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.8 No significant difference was found between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on computer attitude scale.
5.9 There was no significant difference between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and teacher educators having lower class socio economic status on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.10 Teacher educators having middle class socio economic status had more favorable computer attitude as compare to lower class socio economic status on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.11 There was significant difference between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale. Teacher educators having middle class socio economic status had more favorable computer attitude as compare to lower class socio economic status on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

5.12 There was significant difference between teacher educators having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on computer attitude scale. Teacher educators having middle class socio economic status have more favorable computer attitude as compare to lower class socio economic status on computer attitude scale.

**Hypothesis-6:** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of prospective teachers formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer attitude is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

6.1 Male prospective teachers had more favorable attitude towards computer on affective dimension as compare to female prospective teachers.

6.2 There was no significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

6.3 Male prospective teachers had more favorable attitude towards computer on cognitive dimension as compare to female prospective teachers.

6.4 There was significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on computer attitude scale. Male prospective teachers had more favorable attitude towards computer as compare to female prospective teachers.

6.5 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.
6.6 There was significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on affective dimension of computer attitude scale. Science discipline prospective teachers had more favorable computer attitude on behavior dimension than humanities discipline prospective teachers.

6.7 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

6.8 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on computer attitude scale.

6.9 There was significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on affective dimension of computer attitude scale. Prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status had more favorable computer attitude as compare to lower class socio economic status on affective dimension of computer attitude scale.

6.10 Prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status had more favorable computer attitude as compare to lower class socio economic status on behavior dimension of computer attitude scale.

6.11 There was no significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on cognitive dimension of computer attitude scale.

6.12 No significant difference was found between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and lower class socio economic status on computer attitude scale.

**Hypothesis-7:** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer self-efficacy is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

7.1 There was no significant difference between various groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.
7.2 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.3 A significant difference was found between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.4 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of gender on computer self-efficacy scale.

7.5 A significant difference was found between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.6 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.7 There was no significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.8 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of discipline on computer self-efficacy scale.

7.9 A significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio economic statuses on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.10 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio economic statuses on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.11 No significant difference was concluded between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio-economic status on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

7.12 There was significant difference between one or more groups of teacher educators and prospective teachers formed on basis of socio economic status on computer self-efficacy scale.
Hypothesis-8: The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of teacher educators formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer self-efficacy is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

8.1 There was no significant difference between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.2 No significant difference was found between female teacher and male teacher educators on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.3 Male teacher educators have more computer self-efficacy as compare to female teacher educators on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.4 There was no significant difference between female teacher educators and male teacher educators on computer self-efficacy scale.

8.5 No significant difference was found between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.6 There was no significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.7 No significant difference was found between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.8 There was significant difference between science discipline teacher educators and humanities discipline teacher educators on computer self-efficacy scale. Humanities background teacher educators have more computer self-efficacy than science background teacher educators.

8.9 There was no significant difference between teacher educators of middle class socio economic status and teacher educators of lower class socio economic status on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.10 No significant difference was found between teacher educators of middle class socio economic status and teacher educators of lower class socio economic status on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.
8.11 There was no significant difference between teacher educators of middle class socio economic status and teacher educators of lower class socio economic status on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

8.12 There was no significant difference between teacher educators of middle class socio economic status and teacher educators of lower class socio economic status on computer self-efficacy scale.

**Hypothesis-9:** The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among various groups of prospective teachers formed on the basis of gender, discipline and socio economic status in respect to their computer self-efficacy is partially accepted and partially rejected. Following findings were drawn from analysis of data:

9.1 There was no significant difference between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.2 A significant difference was found between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale. Male prospective teachers have higher computer self-efficacy on intermediate level of competency dimension than their female counterparts.

9.3 No significant difference was found between female prospective teachers and male prospective teachers on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.4 Male prospective teachers had higher computer self-efficacy than female prospective teachers.

9.5 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.6 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.7 No significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.8 There was no significant difference between science discipline prospective teachers and humanities discipline prospective teachers on computer self-efficacy scale.
9.9 No significant difference was found between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and prospective teachers having lower class socio economic status on basic level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.10 Prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status had more computer self-efficacy on intermediate level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale as compared to prospective teachers having lower class socio economic status.

9.11 There was no significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and prospective teachers having lower class socio economic status on advance level of competency dimension of computer self-efficacy scale.

9.12 There was no significant difference between prospective teachers having middle class socio economic status and prospective teachers having lower class socio economic status on computer self-efficacy scale.

Hypothesis-10: The null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between computer use and computer anxiety of teacher educators is fully accepted. No significant relationship was observed between computer use and computer anxiety among teacher educators.

Hypothesis-11: The null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between computer use and computer anxiety of prospective teachers is fully accepted. No significant relationship was observed between computer use and computer anxiety among prospective teachers.

Hypothesis-12: The null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between computer anxiety and computer self-efficacy of teacher educators is fully accepted. No significant relationship was observed between computer anxiety and computer self-efficacy among teacher educators.

Hypothesis-13: The null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between computer anxiety and computer self-efficacy of prospective teachers is fully accepted. No significant relationship was observed between computer anxiety and computer self-efficacy among prospective teachers.
5.2 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY
The present study observed significant differences in computer anxiety, computer attitude and computer self-efficacy with respect to gender, discipline and socio economic status. On the basis of findings important implications can be drawn for educational policy makers, college administers and future researchers. Implications of present study are given in following subsections:

5.2.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKERS
This study concluded that most of the teacher educators i.e. 90.67 percent teacher educators had favorable attitude towards computer and 29.34 percent had medium level of computer anxiety but less than half i.e. 46 percent teacher educators had higher level of computer self-efficacy. In case of prospective teachers, the present study concluded that only 11.34 percent prospective teachers had high computer anxiety, more than half i.e. 52 percent had favorable attitude towards computer but less than half i.e. 42 percent had higher level of computer self-efficacy. Thus, this study can help educational policy makers in strategic planning of teacher education institutions for professional development of teacher educators and prospective teachers by focusing more on computer use in daily practices.

5.2.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTES
Following strategic plan can help teacher education institutions to promote computer in teacher education course:

- This study can help for administrators of teacher education institutes to design content of capacity building programmes for teacher educators by focusing on maximum computer use.
- At the beginning of the course, there should be an orientation programme which focused on importance of computer in teacher education. Guest lecturers can be organized by eminent persons who should emphasize on significance of computer. The lecturer should initiate an open discussion session in which trainee teachers should be free to ask and clear their inquiries.
- The teacher education institution should provide hand to hand experience to operate computer by organizing computer training workshop for learning of basic computer skills. The workshop should focus on:
Use the computer for basic purposes.
Importance of computer in classroom practices.
Working with MS Word.
Working with MS Excel.
MS Power Point and to prepare good power point presentation.
Use of IT Applications such as e-learning / multimedia animation.
Use of Internet and various search engines.

- The teacher education institution should provide facility of internet in campus. Also campus should be equipped with Wi-Fi facility. In this modern scenario maximum students have smart phones, they should motivate to use it for various educational purpose.
- The classroom should be equipped with latest technology gadgets like LCD projectors, OHP and other teaching aids to provide better learning experience. The teacher educators should deliver their lecture through power point presentation.
- The teacher education institutes should made it mandatory for all the prospective teachers to deliver micro teaching lesson plans through power point presentation.
- The teacher education institution should provide time-slot in time table for computer learning.
- As per NCTE norms every teacher education institutions should equipped with ICT lab and internet connection. The teacher educators should motivate prospective teachers to visit ICT labs regularly.

### 5.2.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- The present study is limited to only six districts of Himachal Pradesh. Similar study can be conducted on all districts of Himachal Pradesh.
- The present study is confined to only teacher educators and prospective teachers but similar study can be done on primary, secondary, tertiary teachers, D.Ed. and M.Ed. students.
- The present study is limited to Himachal Pradesh only; similar study can be done on other states of India.
- The present study is confined to sample comprising 300 respondents; it may be extended to state level.