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Executive Summary

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.

The Problem of the study:

The problem of the present study was 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.

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 null form at the stage of analysis of data through appropriate non parametric tests explained in the subsequent chapter.

Definition of the 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 & self efficacy.

**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 through a job. Why? In contrast to externals, internals exhibit more motivation and willingness to
take action in their initial endeavours, which has been shown to relate to significantly more second-level endeavours.

Why are externals more dissatisfied? The answer is probably that they perceive themselves as having little control over the 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 job.

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. Employees 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 or teachers are somehow better than externally controlled managers/teachers. However, such generalizations are not yet warranted because there is some contradictory evidence. 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 as a theory has been shown to have relevance in explaining goal setting behaviour, leadership behaviour and poor employee performance. However, like other constructs is 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) leader providing feedback to poor performers is significantly affected by the performance attributions 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.
The locus of control, thus, refers to a person’s belief about whether or not contingency relationship exists between the behavior performed and reinforcement which follows.

**SELF EFFICACY:**

It refers to an individual's belief that he or she is capable of performing a task. The higher is one's self efficacy, the more confidence one may have in his 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.

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

**Delimitations:**

The present study has been delimited in its scope geographically in so far as it has been 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 classroom teaching. Due to paucity of resources and 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 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 face as well as logical validity was found to appear quite satisfactory.

The sample size of the study has 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.

Survey of the related study:

The survey of related studies has been summarily presented in respect of teaching behavior and the personality characteristics specially related to the domains of self efficacy and locus of control forming part of this research. It indicates that a good many probes have been undertaken in the past three decades showing concern for classroom interactional settings, motivational dispositions and the personality characteristics of the participants who were either in-service teachers or pre-service B.Ed. trainees. The screening of these studies has provided positive strength to the development of the plan and design of the study undertaken and reported here. The design of the present research has been explained at some length so as to highlight the strategies and policies adopted in respect of hypothesis formulation and the overall data analysis procedures followed.

Methodology of the Present Research:

The present study was concerned chiefly with identifying the classroom interaction styles of B.Ed. trainees and exploring and estimating
the possible relationship between interaction styles and the two important personality variables as identified in terms of locus of control and self efficacy. The design of study was based on ex-post facto method which requires and mandates the analysis of relationships among variables as already available and determined in the research situation. In the framework of this research locus of control and self efficacy have been stipulated as independent variables and classroom interaction style of B.Ed. trainees as the dependent variable. Thus, the purpose of the study was to examine whether any possible relationship can be set up between locus of control and self efficacy of student-teachers on the one hand and their classroom interaction style on the other.

These variables were defined on the basis of the conceptual anchors and explanations available through the researches of Rotter (1966) for locus of control, Bandura (1977, 1986) for teaching efficacy and Ned Flanders (1963, 1965) for classroom interaction analysis.

**Population and Sample of the study:**

In the present study the population was defined as the entire state of Jharkhand in which the teacher education sector of B.Ed. self financing institutions has been established under the provision of universities jurisdiction and which have been duly recognized by the NCTE- an apex body at the national level for according formal permission to run the B.Ed. courses. In the state of Jharkhand there are 105 B. Ed Teacher education institutions recognized by NCTE. These institutions are affiliated to the five state universities.

Tools used in the present study were three: Flanders ‘ Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) for studying teaching behavior, Scale for locus
of control for measuring internality and externality in personality disposition and Scale for self efficacy. The latter two were developed and validated by the researcher himself using a logical validity procedure and their reliability was found to be 0.53 and 0.75 respectively using a test-retest method. The FIAC as used in the study investigates primarily the verbal behaviour of a teacher and students in a classroom setting in order to enhance understanding in classroom processes and thus to improve teaching behaviour (Amidon and Flanders 1971). The Flanders’ system is composed of ten categories of verbal behaviour. These are divided into two major parts- Talk (teacher talk and pupil talk) and silence and confusion (Sc).

In the present research behaviour ratios were worked out which rendered the analysis into quite distinct and easy to understand units. This method required a ratio based on the matrices for the total groups, for the male sub group and the female sub group of student-teachers as formed for the purposes of this study. The twelve behaviour ratios were used.

**Data Analysis and its Design:**

The data obtained from the various tools as described in the previous section were analyzed using a Non-Parametric test in addition to graphical representations and numerical analysis. For judging the interaction styles of B.Ed. trainees the variables used were Teacher Talk (T.T.), Pupil Talk (P.T.), Silence or Confusion (S.C), Teacher Question Ration (TQR), Pupil Initiation Ratio (PIR), Teacher Immediate Response Ratio (ITRR), Instantaneous Teacher Question Ratio (ITQR), Content Cross Ratio (CCR), Steady State Ratio (SSR), Pupil Steady State Ratio (PSSR) and Indirectness calculated as id ratio.
All the 12 variables were called interaction variables and were obtained from the master matrices constructed for the total group and the subgroups of male and female B.Ed. student-teachers as mentioned earlier. The findings in this regard are summarized as follows:

**The values of ratio rendered in percentages for the twelve variables in respect of total, male and female groups of student teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pupil Talk</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher Response Ratio</td>
<td>33.43%</td>
<td>30.68%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher Question Ratio</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>7.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pupil Initiation Ratio</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher Immediate Response Ratio</td>
<td>53.61%</td>
<td>63.01%</td>
<td>58.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instantaneous Question Ratio</td>
<td>91.17%</td>
<td>95.20%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Content Cross Ratio</td>
<td>77.91%</td>
<td>81.04%</td>
<td>79.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Steady State Ratio</td>
<td>76.74%</td>
<td>80.20%</td>
<td>78.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pupil Steady State Ratio</td>
<td>87.37%</td>
<td>90.40%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indirectness</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These have been graphically depicted as in the figure which follows
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Figure 4.1 Graphical representation of Data

On the basis of data analysis in this context, it has been observed that the value of teacher talk ratio for total group of student-teachers is 91% and for the male group it is found to be 90% and for the female group it is 92% which shows that the teacher talk of male group is relatively less than that of the teacher talk of female group of student teachers and the total group of student-teachers.
It is also apparent from the findings that in respect of pupil talk ratio of student-teachers, the value for the total group of student-teachers is found to be 7.34% and for female student-teachers it is 6.81% whereas for male student-teachers it is 7.87% which indicates that pupil talk ratio of male student-teachers is slightly more than that of pupil talk ratio of female group of student-teachers and also that of total group of student-teachers.

In the classroom interaction setting, it has been observed that the value of silence or confusion for total group of student-teachers is found to be 1.70% and for female group of student it is 1.28% whereas for male group of student-teachers it is found to be 2.12 which suggests that the percentage ratio of silence or confusion is more than that of female group of student-teachers as also that of total group of student-teachers.

Similarly for the teacher response ratio it has been observed that the value of teacher response ratio for the total group of student-teachers is 32.00% and for female group of student teachers it is found to be 30.68% whereas the value for male group of student teacher is found to be 33.43%.

At the second stage of analysis the self-efficacy scores and their range was worked out. On the basis of this range of self-efficacy scores three groups of student teachers were formed as follows.

The self-efficacy scores in between 153-166 were the basis for forming low self-efficacy group, 167-180 for medium self-efficacy group and 181-194 as high self-efficacy group. Subsequently these three groups were analyzed on the basis of their id ratio. The cross breaks for the total
group, male group and female group were formed in order to compute contingency co-efficient via chi-square for each group separately.

In the present research the substantive hypotheses formulated in respect of self efficacy and interaction styles postulated that the former influences the latter. In other words, the self-efficacy of a student teacher is likely to influence his/her interaction style in the classroom instruction. This hypothesis was put to test through setting of a cross break for the total group as well as for the male and female groups of B.Ed. student teachers.

The value of chi square for estimating the extent of association between self efficacy scores and indirectness came out to be 1.012 which is statistically not significant. Accordingly the value of contingency co-efficient works out to be 0.13 which tends to reinforce the contention that indirectness of student- teachers and their self efficacy scores are not related. This, however, may also be treated as an evidence for a low degree of relationship between the two variables. Thus, it lends moderate support by and large to the averment in respect of research hypothesis (Ho1) that ‘the self efficacy of student teachers influences their interaction styles’, does not seem to be sustainable in the face of the evidence available.

**Relation Between Self Efficacy and id Ratio for Male Group of Student Teachers:**

The value of chi square for self efficacy scores and id ratio in respect of male group is 2.36, which is not significant. The value of contingency co-efficient which is 0.27 is again not significant. In the light of above evidence it may be stated that interaction styles of male student teachers although do not depend on their self efficacy scores there seems to be a moderate association between the two variables.
On the basis of the testimony available, it appears that the hypothesis suggesting the dependence of interaction style on self efficacy of B.Ed. student teachers although cannot be supported and sustained in respect of the total group but the same can be treated as acceptable and plausible for the male group and the female group of the B.Ed. student teachers when taken separately.

**Relation Between Locus of Control and Interaction Styles of B.Ed. Student Teachers:**

The second hypothesis of this study related to exploring the extent of relationship between the two variables—the locus of control and interaction styles of B.Ed. student teachers.

The value of chi square obtainable in this regard from the cross breaks is 6.35 which is statistically not significant. The value of contingency coefficient works out to be 0.30 which again shows a moderate relationship between locus of control and interaction styles of B.Ed. student teachers as adjudged through id ratio. The research hypothesis in this regard as postulated states that locus of control of a teacher determines the interaction styles of student teachers. The hypothesis so stated is, therefore, retained. Accordingly it may be averred that the locus of control as a personality variable contributes to the interaction style of B.Ed. student teachers in a modest way.

The value of chi square for estimating relation between locus of control and interaction style is statistically not significant. This is further substantiated by the value of contingency coefficient which is 0.36 showing only moderate relationship between locus of control and interaction style of B.Ed. student teachers. The research hypothesis as
indicated earlier is, therefore, not accepted for the male group of B.Ed.
student teachers. Notwithstanding these findings, it may be posited that
with improved and efficacious training procedures, the association between
internality as an indicator of locus of control and indirectness in interaction
styles may be considerably enhanced.

The value of chi square in respect of cross break constructed for
female group comes out to be 9.90 which is observed to be statistically
significant at 0.05 level but not at 0.01 level. The corresponding value of
contingency coefficient is 0.50 which indicates moderate to high
relationship between locus of control and interaction styles for B.Ed.
student teachers of female group. This further lends support to the belief
that locus of control does influence interaction style which is considerably
high in respect of female student teachers but not so for the male group of
student teachers. The research hypothesis that locus of control influences
interaction styles of student teachers is, therefore, partially accepted.

On the basis of this evidence it might be asserted that locus of
control of student teachers does influence the interaction styles making a
difference between male and female groups.

Thus, on the basis of this evidence it may be adduced that both the
variables such as the self efficacy and locus of control when operating
conjointly do not tend to influence classroom interaction styles of student
teachers in a substantial way. There may be several factors which may be
cited to explain this situation but from the present study and the evidence
flowing from it, it will be worthwhile to hold that self efficacy and locus of
control do not influence the classroom interaction of B.Ed. student teachers
as the contents and processes of training situations and the variables related
thereto might be otherwise swaying in a clandestine manner their
functioning in this regard. This has important implications for revisiting the teacher education programmes in the state in particular.

**Generalisations, Conclusions and Implications of the Study**

The following generalisations and conclusions appear to emerge finally from the analysis of teaching behaviour of student-teachers in respect of twelve variables.

- The Teacher Talk (TT) for the total group comes out to be 91% whereas for the male group of student teachers it is 90% and for the female group of student teachers it is 92%. Thus there seems to be no difference in the teacher talk pattern of the three groups.

- The Pupil Talk (PT) for the total group has been found to be 7.34%, while for male group of student teachers it is 7.87% and for female group of student teachers it is 6.81%. Here also there appears to be no disparity in the pattern of pupil talk in respect of all the three groups of student-teachers.

- As to the silence or confusion in the classroom interaction setting, the situation appears to be almost identical. Thus, the silence or confusion for the classroom interactional setting for the total group is 1.70%, for the male student teachers it is 2.12% and for female student teachers it is 1.28%. Thus the silence or confusion in the teaching behaviour associated with male student-teachers seems to be slightly more than that of the total group and also that of the female group of student-teachers.

- The Teacher Response Ratio (TRR) as observed for the total group of student teachers has been found to be 32% while for male group of student teachers it has been found to be 33.43% and for female
group of student teachers it is 30.68%. This shows that the teacher response ratio in the teaching behaviour of female teachers is slightly less than that of male group of student teachers as also that of the total group of student teachers.

- The Teacher Question Ratio (TQR) for the total group has been found to be 7.18%, for male group of student teachers it is 7.85% and for female group of student teachers it is 6.52%. Here also there appears to be no disparity in the pattern of teacher question ratio of all the three groups of student-teachers.

- As to the Pupil Initiation Ratio (PIR) in the classroom interaction setting the situation appears to be somewhat identical. Thus, the pupil initiation ratio for the classroom interactional setting for the total group is 8.47%; for the male group of student teachers it is 9.73% and for female group of student teachers it is 7.01%. Thus, the pupil initiation ratio in the teaching behaviour associated with male student-teachers appears to be slightly more than that of the total group or the female group of student-teachers.

- The Teacher Immediate Response Ratio (TIRR) for the total group has been found to be 58.01%, whereas for the male group of student teachers it is 53.61% and for the female group of student teachers it is 63.01%. Thus, there seems to be no variation in the teacher Immediate Response Ratio of the total group as well as female group of student teachers although it is quite less in magnitude for the male group of student-teachers.

- The Instantaneous Question Ratio (IQR) as observed for the total group has been found to be 93.00% while for male group of student teachers it has been found to be 91.17% and for female group of student teachers it is 95.20%. This shows that the instantaneous
question ratio in the teaching behaviour of female group of student teachers is slightly more than that of male group of student teachers and also that of the total group of student teachers.

- The Content Cross Ratio (CCR) for the total group has been found to be 79.40%, 81.04% for female teachers and 77.91% for male teachers. Here also there appears to be slight variation in the pattern of content cross ratio in respect of all the three groups of student teachers.

- The Steady State Ratio (SSR) as observed for the total group has been found to be 78.47% while for male teachers it has been found to be 76.74% and for female teachers it is 80.20%. This shows that the Steady State Ratio in the teaching behaviour of male group of student teachers is slightly less than that of female group of student teachers and also that of the total group of student teachers.

- As to the Pupil Steady State Ratio (PSSR) in the classroom interaction setting the situation appears to be almost identical. Thus the pupil steady state ratio for the classroom interactional setting for the total group is 88.9%, for the male group of student teachers it is 87.37% and for female group of student teachers it is 90.40%. Thus, in the case of pupil steady state ratio also in the teaching behaviour associated with female group of student-teachers the value in this regard seems to be slightly more than that of the total group or the male group of student-teachers.

- As to the indirectness (id) in the classroom interaction setting the situation does not appear to be quite disparate. Thus, the indirectness for the classroom interactional setting for the total group is 0.47 while for the male group of student teachers it is 0.50 and for female group of student teacher it is 0.44. Thus, apparently
the indirectness in the teaching behaviour associated with male group of student teachers is slightly more than that of the total group or the female group of student-teachers.

**Relationship between self efficacy and interaction styles**

The value of contingency co-efficient as worked out via chi-square to ascertain the relationship between self efficacy and interaction styles of student-teachers comes out to be 0.13. This value shows a very low degree of relationship and on the basis of this evidence it may be stated that self efficacy of student-teachers does not seem to influence the interaction style of student teachers. In other words, it may be stated that classroom interaction style does not appear to have been swayed by the self efficacy scores of student-teachers. Such a situation, however, does not appear to emerge for male and female groups of student-teachers when taken separately. It may be observed that the value of contingency coefficient showing the relationship between self efficacy and id ratio of male group of student teachers is obtainable as 0.27 while for female group of student teachers it is 0.31. Both the values of contingency co-efficient are indicative of a moderate relationship between self efficacy and indirectness of classroom interaction style for male and female group of students teachers when viewed separately. The value of 'C' for female group of student teachers appears to be slightly more (0.31) than that of male group of student-teachers (0.27).

On the basis of this testimony it may be generalised only to the extent that although relationship between self efficacy and indirectness of interaction style of student-teachers of male and female groups appears to be somewhat modest, for the group as a whole it does not seem to be sustainable. It may, therefore, be stated broadly that the interaction styles
of male and female group of student-teachers, may be considered to be contingent on their self efficacy scores.

**Relationship between locus of control and interaction styles of B.Ed. student-teachers:**

The analysis in respect of the relationship between locus of control and interaction styles of B.Ed. student-teachers has been attempted again through setting up a cross break for estimating contingency coefficient via chi-square. The value of 'C' in this regard has been observed to be 0.30 which shows a moderate relationship between locus of control and indirectness of student-teachers.

This situation is observed to be quite different when the analysis was attempted for male and female groups of student-teachers separately. Thus, for the male group of student teachers, the value of 'C' comes out to be 0.36 which is higher than that of the value for total group. For the female group of student-teachers, the value of 'C' is observed to be 0.50 which is much higher than the value of 'C' for male group of student teachers and the student-teachers as a whole.

It may, thus, be generalised to the extent that the interaction style in terms of indirectness appears to be quite significantly related to locus of control of both female as well as the male group of student-teachers. In other words, on the force of this evidence, it will not be hazardous to hold that locus of control which is an important factor leading to internality and externality characteristics of personality dispositions or various other related attributes of student-teachers, does seem to influence their classroom interaction styles in a major way.
Relationship among indirectness, self efficacy and locus of control:

The third hypothesis of the present study was concerned with investigation of the joint effect of self efficacy and locus of control on indirectness of classroom interaction style. The analysis as conducted in this regard was on the basis of a cross break constituted for the purpose. In this cross break self efficacy and locus of control scores were made the basis for identifying high and low categories while indirectness of classroom interaction style was also indicated in the two categories- high and low using a specific bench mark decided for the purpose. Thus, the entire analysis through this cross break was in terms of a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ cross break table. The value of 'C' was obtained as 0.16 which shows a low contingency between indirectness of teaching interaction style and the self efficacy and locus of control treated conjointly. The findings do not seem to suggest that self efficacy and locus of control when taken together as variables influencing classroom interaction styles have a positive contribution although independently their contribution appears to be significant. This tantamounts to asserting that student teachers’ self efficacy and locus of control characteristics contribute in positive terms in so far as their classroom indirectness is concerned but the same appears to be interacting to the extent that their conjoint operation in slightly less or low in absolute terms so to say.

On the basis of the generalisations arrived at in respect of the two independent variables – locus of control and self efficacy, the following specific conclusions may, thus, be adduced in the light of the research hypotheses formulated for this study.

- The substantive research hypotheses as set forth were, the self efficacy of student-teachers influences their interaction styles, the
locus of control of a student-teachers being external and internal determines their interaction styles and the interaction styles of student-teachers are influenced by locus of control and self efficacy separately as well as conjointly.

- As to the first substantive research hypothesis it may be concluded that interaction style of student-teachers seems to be influenced by self efficacy although it suggests only a low degree of relationship when total group of student-teachers is considered. However, when the male and female groups of student teachers are taken separately, the relationship between self efficacy and interaction style of student-teachers appears to scale up a little which indicates a moderate degree of relationship.

Apparently it may be safe to suggest that self efficacy of student-teachers which is a factor of personality characteristics does influence the interaction style of student-teachers although in a moderate way.

- As to the relationship between locus of control and interaction style of B.Ed. student-teachers it may be somewhat convincing to suggest that the internality and externality as evident from the scores of locus of control tend to contribute significantly towards the classroom interaction styles.

From the generalisations arrived at in respect of investigating the joint effect of self efficacy and locus of control on interaction style of student-teachers in the classroom the irresistible conclusion seems to emerge is that both the variables when put together for probe into their contribution do not significantly tend to influence the interaction style of student-teachers.