CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The data collected from the student teachers with regard to Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies, Academic Performance in the undergraduate course and demographic variables were tabulated and analysed with reference to the objectives and hypotheses of the study. The data were subjected to the following analyses: Descriptive Analysis, Differential Analysis, Relational Analysis and Regression Analysis.

4.1 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The descriptive analysis of the data regarding the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies and Academic Performance in the undergraduate course of the student-teachers was described in relation to their Gender, Age, Place of birth, Subject studied in the under-graduate course and Marital status. The mean and standard deviation scores were calculated for the variables.

The Mean and Standard deviation scores of the total sample of the study on Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies are presented in the Table 4.01.
### TABLE 4.01

Mean and Standard Deviation scores of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies and its subscales on the total sample (500)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivated Self-regulated Learning</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>311.57</td>
<td>76.93</td>
<td>28.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>122.09</td>
<td>78.77</td>
<td>11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>189.48</td>
<td>75.79</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>79.15</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>82.73</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>76.55</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>65.76</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>78.10</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>76.97</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>78.45</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>74.52</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>75.73</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>76.10</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.01 reveals that the mean score of the Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies is 76.93%. The mean scores of the Motivation and the subscales Intrinsic Goal Orientation, Extrinsic Goal Orientation, Task Value, Self-efficacy, Rehearsal, Elaboration and Organisation are higher than the mean score obtained by the sample in this study.

The Mean, Standard deviation scores of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies on Demographic variables: Gender, Age, Place of Birth, Subject studied in undergraduate course and Marital status of the student-teachers were calculated and presented in the Table 4.02.
Mean and Standard Deviation scores of Academic Performance on Demographic variables: Gender, Age, Place of Birth, Subject studied in undergraduate course and Marital status of the student-teachers were calculated and presented in the Table 4.03

**TABLE 4.03**

**Mean and Standard Deviation scores of Academic Performance of the student-teachers in their undergraduate course on Demographic variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69.33</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>73.95</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 25 yrs</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 yrs &amp; above</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71.04</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject studied in UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, it is observed that the mean score of the Academic Performance of the student teachers is 73.17%. The mean scores of student teachers those are female, those ages is below 25 years, those birth place is urban, those studied Arts group in the undergraduate course and those unmarried are higher than the mean score of the sample of the study.

4.2 DIFFERENTIAL ANALYSIS

In order to find out the significance of the difference in the Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies and the Academic Performance of the student teachers in their undergraduate course, the test of significance (‘t’ test) was used for the entire sample and various sub samples.

HYPOTHESIS 1:

There is no significant difference between the components of the demographic variables of the student teachers in their Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies.
TABLE 4.04
“t” value between the components of the demographic variables the student teachers in their Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>“t”</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>310.37</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>311.87</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 yrs</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>311.70</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and above</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>311.26</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>310.58</td>
<td>30.08</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>313.95</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject studied in UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>313.52</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>310.25</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>316.43</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>310.53</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that there is no significant difference in the Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies of the student teachers between the components of the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Birth place, Subject studied in undergraduate course and Marital status.
HYPOTHESIS 2:

There is no significant difference between the components of the demographic variables of the student teachers in their motivation.

TABLE 4.05

“t” values between the components of the demographic variables the student teachers in their motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>“t”</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>121.04</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>122.31</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 yrs</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>122.31</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and above</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>121.71</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>123.02</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject studied in UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>122.92</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>121.53</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>123.50</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>121.79</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that there is no significant difference in the motivation of student teachers between the components of the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Birth place, Subject studied in under graduate course and Marital status.
HYPOTHESIS 3:

There is no significant difference between the components of the demographic variables of the student teachers in their learning Strategies.

TABLE 4.06

“T” values between the components of demographic variables of the student teachers in their learning Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>“t”</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>189.33</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>189.51</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 yrs</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>189.40</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and above</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>189.67</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>188.88</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>190.93</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject studied in UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Group</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>190.60</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Group</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>188.71</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>192.93</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>188.74</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that there is no significant difference in the learning Strategies of student teachers between the components of the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Birth place, Subject studied in under graduate course and Marital status.
Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant difference between the male and female student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

**TABLE 4.07**

“t” values between the male and female student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables – Subscales</th>
<th>Male (84)</th>
<th>Female (416)</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>32.97</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found that male and female student teachers do not differ significantly in the sub scales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies except the subscale Control of Learning Beliefs.

It is therefore concluded that female student teachers are higher than the male student teachers in the subscale control of learning beliefs but both of them are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

**Hypothesis 5:**

There is no significant difference between the different age group of student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.
TABLE 4.08

“t” values between the different age group student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables - Subscales</th>
<th>Less than 25 yrs (349)</th>
<th>25 yrs and above (151)</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>44.99</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found that the different age group student teachers do not differ significantly in the sub scales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning except the subscale Control of Learning Beliefs.

It is therefore concluded that the student teachers whose age is less than 25 years are higher than those age is 25 years and above in the subscale control of learning beliefs but both are same in other sub scales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

**Hypothesis 6:**

There is no significant difference between the urban born and rural born student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.
TABLE 4.09

“t” values between the urban born and rural born student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables – Subscales</th>
<th>Urban (353)</th>
<th>Rural (147)</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>23.06</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>44.73</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found that urban born and rural born student teachers do not differ significantly in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies except the subscales Extrinsic Goal Orientation and Organisation.

It is therefore concluded that the rural born student teachers are higher than those of urban born in the subscales Extrinsic Goal Orientation and Organisation but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

**Hypothesis 7:**

There is no significant difference between the science group and arts group student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.
TABLE 4.10

“t” values between the Science group and Arts group student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables – Subscales</th>
<th>Arts Group (202)</th>
<th>Science Group (298)</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found that Arts group and Science group student teachers do not differ significantly in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies except the subscale Elaboration.

It is therefore concluded that the arts group student teachers are higher than those of science group in the subscale Elaboration but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

**Hypothesis 8:**

There is no significant difference between the married and unmarried student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.
TABLE 4.11

“t” values between the married and unmarried student teachers in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables - Subscales</th>
<th>Married (88)</th>
<th>Unmarried (412)</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>32.97</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>46.06</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found that married and unmarried student teachers do not differ significantly in the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies except the subscales Test Anxiety, Organisation, Meta-cognition and Help seeking.

It is therefore concluded that the married student teachers are higher than unmarried student teachers in the subscales: Test Anxiety, Organisation, Meta-cognition and Help seeking but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.
Hypothesis 9:

There is no significant difference between the male and female student teachers in their Academic Performance.

TABLE 4.12

“t” value between the male and female student teachers in their Academic Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69.33</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>Sig. at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>73.95</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that male and female student teachers differ significantly in their Academic Performance.

It is therefore concluded that Academic Performance of female student teachers is higher than that of male student teachers.
Hypothesis 10:

There is no significant difference between the different age group student teachers in their Academic Performance.

TABLE 4.13

“t’’ value between the student teachers whose age is less than 25 and those age is 25 years and above in their Academic Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 yrs</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 yrs &amp; above</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that student teachers whose age is less than 25 and those age is 25 years and above do not differ significantly in their Academic Performance.

It is therefore concluded that Academic Performance of student teachers of age less than 25 years and those age is 25 years and above are same.
Hypothesis 11:
There is no significant difference between the urban born and rural born student teachers in their Academic Performance.

**TABLE 4.14**

“t” value between the urban born and rural born student teachers in their Academic Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>Sig. at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71.04</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that urban born and rural born student teachers differ significantly in their Academic Performance.

It is therefore concluded that Academic Performance of urban born student teachers is higher than that of rural born student teachers.
Hypothesis 12:

There is no significant difference between the science group and Arts group student teachers in their Academic Performance.

**TABLE 4.15**

“t” value between the Science group and Arts group student teachers in their Academic Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject studied in UG</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science Group</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>Sig. at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Group</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that science group and arts group student teachers differ significantly in their Academic Performance.

It is therefore concluded that Academic Performance of science group student teachers is higher than that of arts group student teachers.
Hypothesis 13:

There is no significant difference between the married and unmarried student teachers in their Academic Performance.

TABLE 4.16

“t” value between the married and unmarried student teachers in their Academic Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>9.506</td>
<td>Sig at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that married and unmarried student teachers differ significantly in their Academic Performance.

It is therefore concluded that Academic Performance of unmarried student teachers is higher than that of married student teachers.
4.3 RELATIONAL ANALYSIS

The relational analysis of the data regarding the Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies was done by calculating the co-efficient of correlation to find out the relationship between the components of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies and among its subscales.

**Hypothesis 14:**

There is no significant relationship among the Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies, motivation and learning Strategies of student teachers.

**Table 4.17**

‘r’ value among the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies, Motivation and Learning Strategies of the student teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>MSL</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Learning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivated Self Regulated Learning</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.867*</td>
<td>0.956*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.682*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that there is significant correlation among the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies, motivation and learning Strategies of the student teachers.
Hypothesis 15:

There is no significant relationship between the components of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies and its subscales among the student teachers.

Table 4.18

‘r’ value between the components of Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies and its subscales among the student teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>0.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Peer Learning</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Help-seeking</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is found that there is significant relationship between the components of Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies and its subscales among the student students.

**Hypothesis 16:**

There is no significant relationship among the subscales of Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies among the student teachers.
It is found that there exists significant relationship among the subscales of Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies except the subscale test anxiety.

The subscale test anxiety is not significantly related to the subscales Intrinsic Goal Orientation, Task Value, and Self efficacy of Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies.

The subscale test anxiety is significantly and negatively related to the subscale Extrinsic Goal Orientation and positively related to other subscales.

**Hypothesis 17:**

There is no significant relationship between the Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies and the Academic Performance of student teachers.
Table 4.20

‘r’ value between the Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies and the Academic Performance of the student teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component / Subscale</th>
<th>“r”</th>
<th>Component / Subscale</th>
<th>“r”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivated Self-regulated Learning</td>
<td>-0.092*</td>
<td>LEARNING STRATEGIES</td>
<td>-0.119*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>1 Rehearsal</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>2 Elaboration</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 External Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>3 Organisation</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Task Value</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>4 Critical Thinking</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>5 Metacognition</td>
<td>-0.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>6 Time &amp; Study Management</td>
<td>-0.133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Test Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.109*</td>
<td>7 Effort Regulation</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Peer Learning</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Help Seeking</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is found that only Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies, learning Strategies and the subscales Test Anxiety, Meta-cognition and Time & Study Management are significantly and negatively related to Academic Performance and other subscales are not related to Academic Performance of the student teachers.
4.4 REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The regression analysis carried out to find out the subscales of Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies contributing to the Academic Performance of the student teachers.

**Hypothesis 18:**

The subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Strategies are the predictors of Academic Performance of the student teachers.
Table 4.21
Regression Analysis of subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies on Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>F(15,484)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.0467</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficient</th>
<th>Standardised coefficient</th>
<th>‘r’ with constant</th>
<th>Contribution to R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant (Academic Performance)</td>
<td>80.806</td>
<td>6.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Value</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Learning Beliefs</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; Study management</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Regulation</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help seeking</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (R²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.046672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F value 1.584 for (15,484) df shows that there is no significant contribution of the subscales of the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies to the Academic Performance of the student teachers.

From the R square value ($R^2=0.0467$), it is evident that only 4.67% of the total variance in Academic Performance is explained by the variance of the linear combinations of the subscales of the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies. The remaining percentage of variance 95.33 is to be accounted by other factors.

It is therefore concluded that the efficiency of prediction of the subscales of Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies is very less and negligible on Academic Performance of the student teachers.

It is further revealed that only the subscale meta-cognition of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies is highly contributed to the Academic Performance than the other subscales.
4.5 FINDINGS

The major findings of this study are given below.

1. There is no significant difference in the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies of the student teachers between the components of the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Birth place, Subject studied in undergraduate course and Marital status.

2. There is no significant difference in the motivation of the student teachers between the components of the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Birth place, Subject studied in undergraduate course and Marital status.

3. There is no significant difference in the learning Strategies of the student teachers between the components of the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Birth place, Subject studied in undergraduate course and Marital status.

4. The female student teachers are higher than the male student teachers in the subscale control of learning beliefs but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

5. The student teachers whose age is less than 25 years are higher than those ages is 25 years and above in the subscale control of learning beliefs but both are same in other sub scales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.
6. The rural born student teachers are higher than those of urban born in the subscales Extrinsic Goal Orientation and Organisation but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

7. The Arts Group student teachers are higher than those of Science Group in the subscale Elaboration but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

8. The married student teachers are higher than unmarried student teachers in the subscales: Test Anxiety, Organisation, Meta-cognition and Help seeking but both are same in other subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies.

9. The female student teachers are higher than the male student teachers in their Academic Performance in the undergraduate course.

10. The student teachers whose age is less than 25 years and those age is 25 years and above are same in their Academic Performance in the undergraduate course.

11. The urban born student teachers are higher than the rural born student teachers in their Academic Performance in the undergraduate course.

12. The Science group student teachers are higher than the Arts group student teachers in their Academic Performance in the undergraduate course.
13. The unmarried student teachers are higher than the married student teachers in their Academic Performance in the undergraduate course.

14. There is significant relationship among the Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies, Motivation and Learning Strategies of the student teachers.

15. There is significant relationship between the components and the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies of the student teachers.

16. There is significant relationship among the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies of the student teachers.

17. Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies, Learning Strategies and the subscales Test Anxiety, Meta-cognition and Study & Time Management are significantly and negatively related to Academic Performance and other subscales are not related to Academic Performance of the student teachers.

18. The efficiency of prediction of the subscales of Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies is less and negligible on Academic Performance of the student teachers.
4.6 CONCLUSION

This study was undertaken to investigate the interrelationships among motivation, learning strategy and Academic Performance among the student teachers. Data were obtained from five hundred student teachers undergoing the one year B.Ed. degree course. The data were collected through Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), an eighty one item survey that measured motivation and learning Strategies.

Pearson correlations showed a statistically significant positive relationship between Motivated Self-regulated Learning Strategies and its subscales, between motivation and learning Strategies, between motivation and subscales of learning Strategies and between learning Strategies and the subscales of motivation.

Pearson correlations showed that the Academic Performance of student teachers has statistically significant negative relationship with the Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies, use of learning Strategies, test anxiety, metacognition and study & time management but no relationship with other subscales. It is concluded that the efficiency of the prediction of subscales of Motivated Self Regulated Learning Strategies is very less and negligible on Academic Performance of the student teachers.
In the following chapter, the investigator will elaborate more on the relationships among the subscales of Motivated Self Regulated learning Strategies that were found in this study. The chapter will also contain recommendations for other students and professionals, and recommendations for future research, as well as the implications of the study.