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Introduction

1.1 Backdrop:

The study of what happens in the classroom has been very rare specially in the context of teacher education programmes in our country. This has obviously resulted in a number of speculations some being rational while others being unfounded and even irrational. Recently our focus of attention has shifted from classroom teaching of teachers to classroom teaching of B.Ed. students who are enrolled for various durations in our teacher education programmes. In the state of Jharkhand which was created in the year 2000 there are 105 teachers colleges in the state at present. The ambit of this study is confined to self financing colleges only and it relates to systematic probes into classroom interaction styles of B.Ed. student-teachers using interaction analysis categories. In order to broaden the conceptual basis of the study, a detailed description of the various interaction analysis systems was attempted in the first instance. In the following sections of this introduction an endeavor has been made to explain the rationale for the use of interaction analysis as a powerful device for depicting classroom interactive processes.

INTERACTION ANALYSIS:

Needless to mention at the very outset that the strength of any educational system largely depends upon the quality of the teachers who sustain it and also the educational planners and administrators who operate the system. The enigma of the measurement of teacher competency arises
again and again in the discussions of educators. Like an uneasy ghost stubbornly revisiting the seminar table, such discussions trail off into acrimony or futility in the face of the controversy aroused by value judgment in hearing the question, “What is the good teaching and who is a good teacher?” The answer to such questions implies two things, firstly what constitutes good teachers and good teaching and secondly how our teachers be enabled to perform their job of teaching in a better way. One of the apparent ways of improving teaching is to strive for effective teacher preparation in teacher education institutions.

A large number of studies on teacher effectiveness carried out during the last two decades have made it more and more apparent that a competent teacher is one who possesses a large repertory of strategies and tactics which he can use at will vis-a-vis pupils in the classroom. And therefore he must first acquire an awareness of and control over his own behavior, which is a necessary pre-requisite to teacher competence.

Then he can go out into school and develop his own ways of being effective in situations. Becoming a fully competent teacher is, thus, a lifelong process rather than a point to be reached.

**THE CONCEPT OF TEACHER BEHAVIOUR:**

Teaching is a dynamic interplay between the teacher, the content and the nature of the pupils. Also teaching is a goal directed activity. Gage (1962) has defined teaching as a system of actions intended to produce learning. A teacher has to perform various tasks. The more goal specific tasks a teacher can accomplish the better person and professional he is
likely to become. Teacher behavior may, therefore, be thought of as observable indicators of a teacher’s ability to perform various goal related tasks. But all teachers cannot be expected to behave the same way in all situations. Because tasks vary, just as do teacher abilities, the behavior teachers exhibit may be different from situation to situation and from subject to subject. The number of universally effective behavior, if there are any is small indeed. Ryans (1967) was quite correct when he defined teacher behavior as the behaviors or activities of persons as they go about doing whatever is required of teachers, particularly those activities which are concerned with the guidance or direction of the learning of others.

Mc Mergney and others suggest that teacher behavior (B) is a function (f) of the characteristics of the teacher or person (P), the teacher development environment (E) and the tasks (T) in which the teacher engages or in other words, B=(f) P.E.T.

Viewed in this framework the operational definition of teacher behavior implies two important postulates.

i) Teacher behavior is a social behavior.

ii) Teacher behavior is a relative concept.

Ryans has indicated two assumptions necessary for a theory of teacher behavior. The first assumption treats the teacher behavior as a function of situational factors and characteristics of individual teachers. This assumption seems to generate the following sub-assumptions:-

I) Teacher behavior is characterized by some degree of consistency.

II) Teacher behavior is always probable rather than certain.
III) Teacher behavior is a function of personal characteristics of individual teachers.

IV) Teacher behavior is characterized by a limited number or set of responses.

V) Teacher behavior is a function of general features of the situations in which it occurs and

VI) Teacher behavior is a function of specific situations in which it takes place.

The second assumption construes the teacher behavior to be observable and appears to suggest the following sub-assumptions.

I) Teacher behaviors are distinguishable.

II) Teacher behavior is measurable and classifiable both qualitatively and quantitatively and.

III) Teacher behavior gets revealed through overt behavior.

Teacher behavior, its nature, genesis and cultivation, its identification and evaluation, in this frame of reference constitutes the core concern not only of teacher training institutions and school systems, but also of society at large that draws its cultural and technical support from teachers to a very great extent for the propagation of accumulated knowledge and values.

THE CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION:

The teaching learning situation has been viewed by different persons differently. The complexities of teaching and learning and their interrelationship, however, require asking the right research questions, let alone finding out answers. An almost overwhelming amount of research on
teaching, following Mitzel (1960) and Dunkin and Biddle (1974), has investigated four types of variables in order to understand and thus encourage effective teaching.

These are briefly discussed below:

I) **Presage Variables**- Those characteristics that teachers carry with them to the classroom contextualities such as age, sex, training experience and various personality traits such as motivation or intelligence are also included in this category of variables.

II) **Context Variables**- These are the conditions to which teachers must adopt. Context variables include pupil characteristics such as age, sex, social class or abilities as well as characteristics of the school and community in which teaching and learning are embedded.

III) **Process Variables**- These are human transactions that occur in the classroom during the course of teaching and learning. They may include all observable behaviors of teachers and pupils directly related to teaching-learning activities as well as other seemingly unrelated observable behaviors of teachers and pupils.

IV) **Product Variable**- These represent outcomes of teaching as measured in term of immediate pupil growth or long term learning outcomes such as beliefs, attitudes, cognitions and insights.

The interrelationship among these variables may be depicted more explicitly through a diagram as it has been attempted through figure (1.1).
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ASSESSING TEACHER BEHAVIOUR:

The complexity of the spontaneous behavior of the teacher makes the study of classroom teaching-learning processes and their related features a bit difficult. It may be noted in this context that an accurate description of what happens in the classroom is not easy to obtain. Since we may be interested in evaluating teachers’ abilities to perform various tasks, systematic examination should provide overt indications of teachers’ needs and abilities as they are revealed in their work with students. Such as these informations may be further useful to make teachers more aware of their own behavior and those of their students. The scientific mode of enquiry has by and large centered on the systematic observations of the phenomenon. The researches of Withal (1949), Flanders and Amidon (1960) Medley and Mitzel (1948) and Galloway (1968) have pioneered the utilization of systematized approaches in the study of the children in the classroom in the U.S.A. and around the world. At least four decades ago systematic observation could be accepted as a method of organizing observed teaching acts in a manner which allows any trained person who follows the stipulated procedures, to observe record and analyze interactions with the assurance that others viewing the same situation would agree to a great extent with his recorded sequence of behaviors.

INTERACTION ANALYSIS:

The word interaction analysis refers to any technique for studying the chain of classroom events in such a fashion that each event is recorded and taken into consideration. The major concern of interaction analysis is reflected in studying the influence pattern of the teacher. The teacher behavior may be exhibited as either verbal or nonverbal or both. In this depiction a system of interaction analysis becomes essentially a process of
encoding and decoding i.e. encoding provides recording of the classroom events in a meaningful manner and decoding helps arranging the data in a useful display followed by analysis and interpretations. Interaction analysis is closely associated with the research of Ned Flanders whose masterful combination of known with the new has led many to refer to him as the ‘Father’ of interaction analysis.

Flanders system is concerned only with the verbal behavior in the classroom. It is a category system having ten categories. One may question Flanders’ restriction of coverage in the ten categories of teacher behavior thus chosen. It is a simple matter to offer criticism. Suggesting the means to obviate this criticism is much more difficult. However, Stones, Morris (1977) and others assert that the method offers considerable scope for the analytical appraisal for the teacher's classroom behavior even if it does only focus on very broad aspects of verbal behavior. Flanders interaction analysis category system (FIAC) represents an outspoken defense of behavioral observation combined with the use of categorical checklist. He presents evidence to show that different patterns of interaction are obtained for teachers of varying abilities, subject matter competence and national contexts. Therefore, Flanders’ work seems to present a simple yet powerful method for studying teacher behavior and is intended to provide a wealth of evidence relating to matters of natural ebb and flow of classroom verbal interchanges derived from initiation and responsive moves.

**OBSERVATION SYSTEMS :**

A desire to understand more of what teaching is all about has been a motivating factor which contributed to the development of various systems of interaction analysis. A considerable amount of work has gone on in the last three decades in defining and developing methods of analyzing
classroom interaction and at present moment there are probably well over hundred and fifty systems. A number of tools are available in Mirrors of Behavior (Simon and Boyer 1970), which have been further extended over the years. In fact, one of the problems of those interested in the field is that of keeping track of new observation instruments as they appear. There is, in addition, a propensity for research. Researchers in the field feel dissatisfied with existing systems for some reason or the other and are motivated to produce their own. It seems understandable since very often such people have specific problems in mind which need instruments with differential emphasis suited to the problems they are investigating. It appears pertinent, therefore, to conclude that a careful selection of interaction analysis system is avowedly of considerable help in increased understanding of classroom verbal interactions and in offering better generalizations.

Richard Ober et. al. (1971) have classified observational systems into two basic kinds: sign and category. A sign system is composed of a ‘list of behaviors’. While a category system provides ‘classification of behaviors’. In a sign system during a given period of time the observer simply checks or marks in some manner each behavior that occurs. Regardless of the frequency of occurrence, the behavior is checked only once during the observation period. On the contrary in a category system, at regular intervals within the observation period the observer determines in what category the observed behavior falls and records that category by indicating a number. A behavior is, thus, encoded as many times as it occurs and also the sequence of occurrence of various behaviors is recorded.
Although Flanders’ system of interaction analysis has been the most popular instrument due to its simplicity, it is not the only approach. For many researchers Flanders’ model has provided a firm basis to undertake studies in the field. A select list of some observational system is presented below :-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Wright Stone</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>New Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Jersild et. al</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Evaluation of activity programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>H.H. Anderson</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Teacher Contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Withal</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Classroom Climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Bales</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Emotional State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Cognitive interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Ryans</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Teacher Characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B.O. Smith et. al</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Cognitive interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Verbal influence patterns of Teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Amidon &amp; Hunter</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Modification of F.I.A.C.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Amidon</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bellack et.al</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Pedagogical significance of verbal interactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the present study classroom interaction styles have been analyzed using Flanders 10 categories system considering its overall simplicity in encoding and decoding the processes of interactional aspect of classroom teaching behavior and the purpose and main burden of this investigation.

1.2 The Problem of the study:

In the backdrop provided earlier it may be safely admitted that classroom interaction styles have rarely been made on object of intensive probe in the context of teacher education. This has added to the avoidable
confusion regarding issues pertaining to effectiveness of teaching in general and in the space of the instructional activities organized in the classrooms in particular.

The student-teachers are sent nay pushed to the teaching practice programmes without adequate preparations in skill practices before being attached to regular classroom teaching in school. Thus, in order to improve the effectiveness of teacher education programmes it will be necessary to explore and use the various skill specific interventions at the practice teaching level with a focus on changing the classroom interactional strategies on the one hand and cultivating the personality characteristics of student - teachers in terms of their locus of control and self efficacy on the other.

The problem of the present study was, therefore, conceptualized and explicated with reference to three important variables, the classroom interaction styles, the locus of control and self efficacy of B.Ed. student - teachers. For the sake of clarity and specificity it was stipulated in unambiguous and succinct terms with area specific delimitation as follows.


1.3 Definition of Variables of the Study :

In the present study the classroom interaction analysis of B.Ed. student-teachers has been analyzed in relation to two specific personality related variables such as locus of control and self efficacy. It will be, therefore in fitness of things to briefly indicate their conceptual structure following which the definition of these variables could be finally
attempted. This has facilitated the process of operationalization of the
variables along with the formulation of specific statements and the
substantive hypotheses for the present research.

**LOCUS OF CONTROL :-**

It has been generally observed that some people believe that they are
masters of their own fate. Other people see themselves as pawns of fate,
believing that what happens to them in their lives is due to luck or chance.
The first types, those who believe that they control their destinies, have
been labelled **internals** whereas the latter, who see their lives as being
controlled by outside forces, have been called **externals**. A person's
perception of the source of his or her fate is termed locus of control.

A large amount of research comparing internals with externals has
consistently shown that individuals who rate high in externality are less
satisfied with their jobs, have higher absenteeism rates, are more alternated
from the work setting and are less involved on their jobs than are internals.
Externals are also less likely to initially get a job. What may be the reason
can be readily perceived. In contrast to externals, internals exhibit more
motivation and willingness to take action in their initial interviews which
has been shown to relate to significantly more second interviews.

Why are externals more dissatisfied? The answer is probably that
they perceive themselves as having little control over the organizational
outcomes that are important to them, internals, facing the same situation;
attribute organizational outcomes to their own actions. If the situation is
unattractive, they believe that they have no one else to blame but
themselves. Also, the dissatisfied internal is more likely to quit a
dissatisfying work or assignment.
The impact of locus of control on absence is an interesting one; Internals believe that health is substantially under their own control through people habits, so they take more responsibility for their health and have better health habits. Consequently, their incidences of sickness and, hence, of absenteeism are lower.

We should not expect any clear relationship between locus of control and turnover because there are opposing forces at work. It has been generally observed that on the one hand, internals tend to take action and thus might be expected to quit jobs more readily, while on the other hand, they tend to be more successful on the job and more satisfied, factors associated with less individual turnover.

The overall evidence indicates that internals generally perform better on their jobs, but that conclusion should be moderated to reflect differences in jobs. Internals search more actively for information before making a decision, are more motivated to achieve, and make a greater attempt to control their environment. Externals, however, are more complacent and willing to follow directions. Therefore, internals do well on sophisticated tasks—which include most managerial and professional Jobs—that require complex information processing and learning. In addition, internals are more suited to jobs that require initiative and independence of action. Almost all successful sales people, for instance, are internals, why? Because it's pretty difficult to succeed in sales if you do not believe you can effectively influence outcomes. In contrast, externals should do well on jobs that are well structured and routine and in which success depends heavily on complying with the direction of others.

Using locus of control, work behaviour may be explained by whether trainees perceive their outcomes as controlled internally or
externally. Trainees who perceive internal control feel that they personally can influence their outcomes through their own ability, skills, or effort, while trainees who perceive external control feel that their outcomes are beyond their own control, they feel that external forces such as luck or task difficulty control their outcomes. This perceived locus of control may have a differential impact on their performance and satisfaction. For example, studies by Rotter and his colleagues suggest that skill versus chance environments differentially affect behaviours. In addition, a number of studies have been conducted in recent years to test the attribution theory-locus of control model in work settings. One study found that internally controlled employees are generally more satisfied with their job, are more likely to be in managerial positions, and are more satisfied with a participatory management style than employees who perceive external control. Other studies have found that internally controlled managers are better performers, are more considerate of subordinates, tend not to burn out, follow a more strategic style of executive action, and have improved attitudes over a long period of time following promotions. In addition, the attribution process has been shown to play a role in coalition formation in the political process of organisation. In particular, coalition members made stronger internal attributions, such as ability and desire, and non-members stronger external attribution, such as luck.

The implication of these studies is that internally controlled managers are somehow better than externally controlled managers. However; such generalizations are not yet warranted because there is some contradictory evidence also. For example, one study concluded that the ideal manager may have an external orientation because the results indicated that externally controlled managers were perceived as initiating
more structure and consideration than internally controlled managers. In addition to the implications for managerial behaviour and performance attribution theory has been shown to have relevance in explaining goal setting behaviour, leadership behaviour and poor employee performance. However, like other constructs in organizational behaviour, attribution is now undergoing considerable refinement in the research literature. For example, recent studies have found that (1) attributions about poor performance are mediated by how responsible the employee is judged to be and how much sympathy the evaluator feels, and (2) leaders providing feedback to poor performers is significantly affected by the performance attribution that are made. A review article concludes that locus of control is related to the performance and satisfaction of organization members and may moderate the relationship between motivation and incentives.

From this overall generic review the locus of control in this study has been taken to refer to a person’s belief about whether or not contingency relationship exists between the behaviour performed and reinforcement which follows. There are two types of locus of control.

a) **Internal locus of control** :- Those student-teachers who are able to perceive the contingency of relationship which exists between their action and outcomes and who consider that their effort and ability determine this contingency.

b) **External locus of control** :- Those student-teachers who generally believe that their outcomes are controlled by forces extrinsic to themselves. Most often, luck, chance and powerful others are considered to be these forces.
Locus of Control was, thus, defined as the perception of contingency between action and their consequences. The same has been measured through a tool prepared by the investigator and standardized in terms of its reliability and protocol procedures.

**SELF EFFICACY:**

It refers to an individual's belief that he or she is capable of performing a task. The higher one's self efficacy, the more confidence one has in his/her ability to succeed in a task. So, in difficult situations, we find that people with low self efficacy are more likely to lessen their effort or give up altogether, while those with high self efficacy will try harder to master the challenge. In addition, individuals high in self efficacy seem to respond to negative feedback with increased effort and motivation while those low in self efficacy are likely to lessen their effort when given negative feedback.

Bandura's social cognitive theory (SCT), incorporates both social/environmental and cognitive elements and the behaviours themselves. The SCT explains psychological functioning in terms of environmental events, internal personal factors in the form of cognitive, affective, and biological variables, and behavioural pattern. These three (environment, personal cognitions, and behaviour) operate as interacting determinants that influence one another in a bidirectional manner. Embedded within SCT, along with the human's capabilities of symbolizing, fore thought, and observational learning, is a self theory including both self-regulation and self-reflection. It is the capability for self-reflection people reflect back on their action/experience with a specific event/task. In this way they view cognitively the entire process and show
how strongly they believe they can successfully accomplish this event/task in the future—that serves as the theoretical basis for self-efficacy.

Bandura emphasizes that this self efficacy is the most pervading and important of the psychological mechanisms of self-influence. He declares "Unless people believe that they can produce desired effects and forestall undesired ones by their actions, they have little incentive to act". Whatever other factors may operate as motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce desired results.

The formal definition of self-efficacy that is usually employed in Bandura's early statement is that of personal judgement or belief of "how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations." A somewhat broader, more workable definition for organizational behaviour is provided by Luthans. According to him self-efficacy refers to an individual's conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute the specific tasks within a given content." It may be noted that this definition deals with efficacy on a specific task and context. To further clarify the exact meaning of self-efficacy as it is translated here for use in the teaching behaviour field, specific versus general efficacy needs to be clarified. Earlier the differentiation between the various positive psychology constructs was briefly discussed, but the difference between self efficacy and closely related established teaching behaviour constructs such as self-esteem, expectancy motivation, and attribution/locus of control also needs to be addressed.
Specific Versus General Self Efficacy:

Specific self efficacy follows Bandura's conceptualization and is widely recognized by almost all efficacy scholars and the psychology field as a whole. In recent years, however, general self-efficacy has been used as another dimension of self efficacy by a few efficacy researchers. They suggest that in addition to specific self efficacy, there is a generalized self efficacy that reflects people's belief in successfully accomplishing tasks across a wide variety of achievement situations. It should be recognized that this generalized efficacy is quite different from Bandura's portrayal of self-efficacy. In particular, the accepted task specific version of self-efficacy is related to a state and it is highly variable depending on the specific task and is cognitively processed by the individual before any effort is expended.

Bandura argues that self-efficacy represents a task and situation specific cognition. On the other hand, general self efficacy is conceptually the opposite, it is trait like. That is, general efficacy is stable over time and across situations. In this regard it is like a personality trait. Bandura contends with his years of theory building and basic research that "an efficacy belief is not a decontextualized trait." However, Bandura and others point out that even though self efficacy is not trait like, this does not mean that specific self efficacy evaluations never generalize. Instead, although not necessarily stable across situations, efficacy judgements on one task may generalize to others depending on the situation, the task, and the person.

In summary, as presented here self efficacy is in conceptual terms a state like and is aimed at specific tasks for example a systems analyst may
have high self-efficacy on solving a particular programming problem, but low self efficacy on writing up a report for the C 10 (Chief information officer) on how the problem was solved.

A brief summary of the major differences with various allied concepts will help clarify the exact meaning of self-efficacy.

1. **Self efficacy vs Self esteem**: following from the preceding discussion of specific vs general self efficacy, there is no question that general self-efficacy is very similar to self-esteem, but the widely accepted specific self-efficacy as used here is quite different. The first difference is that self-esteem is a global construct of one's evaluation and belief of overall worthiness, whereas self efficacy is one's belief about a task, and context-specific capability. Second, self-esteem is stable and trait like, whereas self efficacy is changing over time as new information and task impressions are gained and is state like, finally, self-esteem is aimed at any aspect of one's current self, whereas self-efficacy is a current assessment of one's future success at a task. An example of the differences would be the salesperson who has high self efficacy of selling a luxury item to low-income customers, but low self-esteem because he knows his career has been based on selling unneeded items to his customers and this takes away from their ability to buy some of the basic necessities for their families.

2. **Self efficacy vs. expectancy concepts**: On the basis of expectancy theories of motivation the effort-performance (sometimes called E→P) and behaviour-out come (sometimes referred to as E→O) expectancy relationship), although E→P and self-efficacy would both say that effort leads to performance, self-efficacy involves
much more. Self-efficacy beliefs also involve perceptions of ability, skill, knowledge, experience with the specific task, complexity of the task, and more. In addition, self-efficacy has psychomotor reactions such as emotions, stress and physical fatigue with the E→O (behaviour-outcome expectancy) there is even more pronounced differences. The process is different-efficacy is a judgement of one's ability to successfully execute a certain behaviour pattern (i.e. 'I believe that what I do will (or will not), lead to desired outcomes). In other words, the individual's self efficacy evaluation will usually come before any behaviour outcome expectancies are even considered.

3. Self-efficacy vs attribution/locus of control: The third close, but different, construct that is often confused with self-efficacy comes from attribution theory, specially locus of control. Those who make internal attributions about their behaviour and its consequences (success or failure) believe they are in control of their own fate (e.g. It is my effort as ability that makes the difference) and assume personal responsibility for the consequences of their behaviour. Externals, on the other hand, make attributions to the circumstances (The task was too hard) or to luck and do not take personal responsibility for the consequences of their behaviour. Bandura has argued that locus of control attributions are causal beliefs about action-outcome contingencies, whereas self-efficacy is an individual's belief about his or her abilities and cognitive resources that can be marshalled together to successfully execute a specific task.
Although the differences outlined above may seem quite technical, they must be pointed out to make sure that self efficacy is indeed a valid, independent construct and it helps clarify its exact meaning.

In the background of this conceptual orientation, self efficacy for the purposes of the present research has been construed to refer to teacher belief about his/her ability to influence student outcomes. There are two types of self efficacy assumed:

a) **General Self efficacy :-** It is the belief in the ability of teacher in general to influence student outcomes (Teacher can make a difference)

b) **Personal Self efficacy :-** It means teacher's belief about his/her own ability to affect student’s outcomes.

Self efficacy, thus, implies the capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to manage prospective situation. (Bandura 1995). Self efficacy is self perceived capacity of a person to perform a task successfully.

### 1.4 Objectives and Need of The Study :

In view of the problem statement made earlier and hypotheses formulated in accordance with it the following three objectives were set up for this research.

- To study the classroom interaction styles of B.Ed. student-teachers of self financing B.Ed. Colleges in the state of Jharkhand.
• To probe the relationship between classrooms interaction styles of student-teachers and their locus of control.

• To investigate the extent of association or concomitant relationship between student-teachers classroom interaction styles and their self efficacy scores.

**Need of the study :-** In the state of Jharkhand Teacher education institutions have been recognized as important wings of the universities by granting affiliation as self financing colleges. However, little attention has been paid to the quality parameters on the basis of which these colleges could be managed and regulated with explicit concerns for augmenting the teaching skills of the entrants. The NCTE norms are being followed literally but as to the academic quality of the various programme much can be said which will sound unpalatable. Needless to observe that the practice teaching programmes of the B.Ed. colleges form very important segment and the same have to be continually revamped by introducing innovative strategies. The student–teachers have to be given rich grounding in the form of acquiring classroom competencies as their developmental needs to be focused on the one hand and their classroom teaching skills which they have to be appropriately and adequately equipped on the other. For the latter micro teaching and classroom interaction analysis session have to be rigorously enforced and adopted. The present study is intended to explore the possibilities and the need for organizing such training programmes and induction courses through making a systematic application and use of the analysis of the classroom interaction processes to be planned and executed by the B.Ed. students, focusing on their personality attributes of locus of control and self efficacy. The
study may, thus, provide a sound basis for designing effective practice teaching programmes in a bid to accentuate the quality concerns of teacher education in the state as a whole.

1.5 Hypotheses of the Study :-

Based on these three variables the main substantive research hypotheses were formulated as follows.

**Research Hypothesis (i)**: The self efficacy of student-teachers influences their interaction styles.

**Research Hypothesis (ii)**: Locus of control of a teacher being external or internal determines the interaction styles of student-teachers.

**Research Hypothesis (iii)**: The interaction style of student-teachers is influenced by locus of control and self efficacy separately as well as conjointly.

All these research hypotheses were rendered in the form of null Hypothesis (HO) at the stage of analysis of data through use of appropriate non parametric tests explained in the subsequent chapter.

1.6 Scope of the study: -

The present study is related to broadly assessing the relationship between two independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variables being two-self efficacy and locus of control the domain of personality and the dependent variable is concerned with classroom behavior of student-teachers as evident from their classroom interactional styles. The locus of control stipulated as independent variable
was appraised in terms of Internality and Externality of attribution patterns while self efficacy was measured in terms of self perceived capacity to perform a task successfully. These tasks were spread over various teaching-learning processes in which student-teachers may be required to manage, perform and indicate their valuations. Although in the scope of the study the entire state of Jharkhand was contemplated as the target population, the functional frame was confined to only one university in the state and its affiliated colleges for obvious reasons of paucity of resources at the disposal of the researcher.

Similarly the teaching behaviour has been studied in terms of classroom interaction style as was applicable in teaching of various school subjects prescribed by the concerned school system. The study attempted to examine the various aspects of teaching behaviour on the basis of twelve variables as conceptualized under the general scheme of this research. These variables have already been described in the relevant section.

1.7 Delimitations of the study:

As mentioned in the scope of this study, its area of operation was restricted geographically in so far as it has been, thus, confined to the state of Jharkhand only. In conceptual terms it has been delimited to classroom interaction styles as evident and adjudged from category system of classroom interactions captured and reflected in audio taped presentations of class room teaching. Due to paucity of resources and also of time only two personality variables such as locus of control and self efficacy have been probed. For ascertaining the locus of control and self efficacy the investigator has himself prepared research tools with their reliability estimated as 0.53 and 0.77 respectively. Additionally in order to vouch the
validity of these tools they were critically reviewed by experts and their logical and face validity was found to appear quite satisfactory.

The sample size of the study has also been restricted to three teachers colleges of Vinoba Bhave University, Hazaribag in the Jharkhand state which may be taken as representative of the self financing B.Ed. colleges in the state. A detailed description of the choice of the sample has been given separately in chapter III.

1.8 Summing up

In summary, therefore, it may be stated that the present chapter delineates at some length the background of the study with focus on the conceptual issues relating to the problem and the variables selected. It specifically mentions the problem and its ambit as such along with the substantive research hypotheses formulated and the definitions of the variables as identified. Finally, the objectives and need of the study have been indicated so as to set a specific boundary of the research and its justification. Accordingly conceptual and area specific delimitations have been clearly set forth. In the subsequent chapter a survey of related studies and the outcomes thereon have been described in order to highlight the status of knowledge as obtainable in the domain of this research.