CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION

“If the destiny of a nation is being shaped in her classroom, then the real destiny maker is the teacher”- Dr. Kothari.

Education is an integral part of every human being. It moulds him to be a good citizen, who is really an asset of the country. That is why, Adam Smith, the Father of Economics once remarked, “The wealth of a nation depends on the education of its citizens”. Teachers have a noble role in imparting knowledge to the innumerable members in a society. The teacher plays an important role in the educational process. On the calibre of the teacher depends the success with which new methods are employed and adopted. On the enthusiasm of the teacher depends, the establishment of new teaching and working out of the new system. On the insight of the teacher depends, the effects of methods and systems on the child. On the idealism of the teacher depends whether education shall be child-centered or not. In a word, on the teacher depends the success of all efforts to provide progressive education and to establish progressive schools. On the teacher depends the development of the coming generation and hence the future of the society.

The Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) in its report observes that the important factor in the contemplated educational reconstruction is the teacher-his personal and educational qualities, his professional training and the place he occupies in the school and in the community. The representation of a school and its influence on the life of a community depends on the kind of teachers working in it.
The report of the Education Commission (1964-66) also gives emphasis to the above point by saying that of all the different factors which influence the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the quality, competence and character of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant. An effective teacher, therefore, is a must for educational improvement which we are striving hard to bring about. A teacher is thought of simultaneously as a director of learning, as a friend and counsellor of pupils, as a member of a group of professional people and as a citizen participating in various community activities.

1.2. CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD TEACHER

The profile of an outstanding teacher would be one who possesses erudition and reputation in the academic community and shows genuine interest and love for students. He / She should be a living example of a person who possesses and practises understanding, tolerance, co-operation and seeks to inculcate values and should be affluent in professional knowledge and performance.

A good teacher should possess intelligence, breadth of knowledge plus special insights in some areas, emotional soundness, integrity, respect for personality, understanding of the community and good citizenship. The good teacher would be fond of children and youth, have an understanding of human growth and development, of the learning process, and of the techniques of evaluation, would have a sound social philosophy supported by conviction and knowledge, would be a good citizen of school, would possess scholarship, and would believe in the worth of his work.
Recent researches suggest impartiality, calmness, consistency, sociability, intelligence, willingness to adapt to classroom situations, objectivity, resourcefulness and interest in teaching as the characteristics of a good teacher.

The Handbook of Secondary Colleges of Education (NCERT) points out the following as the characteristics of a good teacher.

a) creating own methods according to the situation
b) creative with individuality, originality and spontaneity
c) never at a loss for words or ideas
d) resourceful in tackling problems and not exhibiting any object for conformity.

1.3. EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

It is observed that people in all organizations seem to be concerned about the ability of the people to know, to manage and to regulate their emotions. They feel that it is better to lose brilliant candidates, who have trouble in getting along, and get those people whose skills are average but have the ability to know and manage their own emotions and those of others. They believe that such a person can be trained for the benefit of the organization and for oneself. This ability to manage people and to manage one’s own emotions is termed emotional intelligence.

The concept of emotional intelligence is an umbrella term that captures a broad collection of individual skills and dispositions usually referred to as soft skills or interpersonal or intrapersonal skills that are outside the traditional areas of specific knowledge, general intelligence, and technical or professional skills. In order to be well adjusted, as a fully functioning member of the society one must possess both
traditional intelligence and emotional intelligence (EI). EI involves being aware of emotions that affect and interact with traditional intelligence.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) in their initial theoretical paper have defined emotional intelligence as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions”. This definition talks about perceiving and regulating emotions and omit thinking about feelings.

Taking a clue from the above cited definition, Daniel (1995) defines emotional intelligence as “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well, in ourselves and in our relationships.”

Again in 1997 Mayer and Salovey introduced a revised and more complex definition of emotional intelligence. Accordingly,

“EI involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise and express emotions, the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth.”

Another definition is that, “The expression emotional intelligence indicates the kind of intelligence or the skill that involves the ability to perceive, assess and positively influence one’s own and other people’s emotions.”
1.3.1. DIMENSIONS OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Self-awareness

Self-awareness is knowing one’s feelings. It is a deep understanding of one’s emotions, in terms of how feelings affect oneself, other people, and their job performance. According to Goleman (1998), self-awareness consists of emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence.

Self-regulation

Self-regulation is managing one’s feelings, especially the distressing ones. Self-regulation consists of self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability and innovation.

Motivation

Motivation is attributed to those people who are passionate about their work or any kind of endeavour. Motivation is not driven by external rewards, but rather by a desire to achieve. Motivation includes achievement drive, commitment, initiative and optimism (Goleman, 1998).

Empathy

Empathy is recognizing the emotion in others. People with empathy understand others, help to develop others, have service orientation and political awareness (Goleman, 1998).
Social skills

Social skills include popularity, leadership and interpersonal effectiveness. People with social skills can influence others, communicate well, manage conflict situations, give inspiring leadership, and build team spirit and collaboration (Goleman, 1998).

Significance of EI

It is emotional intelligence that motivates one to pursue his innermost values and aspirations and transforms them from things he thinks about to what he lives.

According to Salovey et al.(1999) those who score high in the ability to perceive accurately, understand and perceive other’s emotions, and are better able to respond flexibly to changes in their social environments and build supportive social networks.

It is found that stars in any field, because of their skills in working with others, get answered first when they have questions and as a result they are able to stride past their competitors. While cognitive thinking gets one “into the game” emotional skills show greater progress at a more rapid rate. People who are better in emotional intelligence get more out of being better because they can leverage other people’s abilities very effectively. They make excellent leaders and managers.

Skills for Improving EI

i. Develop optimism and ability to persist in the face of frustration

ii. Internalize success and externalize failure

iii. Have faith in oneself
iv. Take responsibilities for one’s emotions and happiness
v. Develop constructive coping skills for specific moods
vi. Be honest with oneself
vii. Show respect by considering other people’s feelings
viii. Pay attention to nonverbal communication

1.3. SELF-EFFICACY

With the development of micro-analytic methodology for testing propositions about the origins and functions of perceived self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), research attempts were addressed to the processes governing the interrelationship between knowledge/skill and action. It has been a point of common observation that knowledge transformational operations and component skills are necessary but insufficient for accomplished performances. Indeed, people often do not perform optimally even though they know well what to do. This is because self-referent thought also mediates the relationship between knowledge and action. It becomes important to know how people judge their capabilities and how through their self-percepts of efficacy, they affect their behavioural outcome.

The theoretical construct which now regularly appears in the literature of industrial and organizational psychology was previously first defined in social psychology. The concept of self-efficacy was first of all put forth and developed by Albert Bandura (1977, 1986). Self-efficacy is a key concept in Bandura’s social learning theory (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as “people’s judgements of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated
types of performances.” In other words, self-efficacy is a person’s belief about his or her chances of successfully accomplishing a specific task. It is belief in one’s ability to do a task. Self-efficacy arises from the gradual acquisition of complex, cognitive, social, linguistic, and/or physical skills through experience (Bandura, 1977). Wood and Bandura (1989) stated that “self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivations, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands.”

An individual with high self-efficacy has more confidence in his ability to succeed in a task. It is observed that in difficult situations, 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; whereas those low in self-efficacy are likely to lessen their effort when given negative feedback (Bandura, 1986).

Bandura’s self-efficacy theory provides explicit guidelines on how to develop and enhance human efficacy. In the exercise of human agency, the most central or pervasive mechanism of personal agency through which people make causal contributions to their own psychosocial functioning is people’s beliefs in personal efficacy. Efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate themselves and act, for the diverse causal tests consistently show that such beliefs contribute significantly to human motivation and attainments.

Self-efficacy is a construct derived from social-cognitive theory—a theory positing a triadic reciprocal causation model in which behaviour, cognitions and the environment all influence each other in a dynamic fashion (Bandura, 1977, 1986).
Bandura suggested that four categories of experiences are used in the development of self-efficacy. The foremost and most effective way of creating a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences and these provide the most reliable testimony whether one can mobilize whatever it takes to supervene (Felz et al. 1979; Gist, 1989). Success helps in building a sound belief in one’s personal efficacy. Failures can prove hurdle, especially if they occur before a sense of efficacy is firmly established. Development of self-efficacy through this method involves acquiring the cognitive behavioural and self-regulatory tools for creating and executing appropriate courses of action in order to manage ever changing life-circumstances.

The second influential way creating and strengthening efficacy is vicarious experiences (modelling) provided by social models. Seeing people similar to themselves succeed by perseverant effort raises observers’ beliefs that they too possess the capabilities to master comparable activities (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1987). In the same way, observing others fail despite high effort lowers observers’ judgements of their own efficacy and undermines their level of motivation. Thus, the impact of modelling on personal efficacy beliefs is greatly and strongly influenced by the perceived similarity to the models.

Social persuasion is the third way of strengthening people’s beliefs about their success. People who are persuaded verbally that they posses the capabilities to master given activities are likely to mobilize greater effort and sustain it than if they harbour self-doubts and abide by personal deficiencies when problems arise. It is observed that it is more difficult to instil high beliefs in personal efficacy by social persuasion alone than to undermine them.
The fourth way of modifying self-beliefs of efficacy is to reduce people's stress reactions and alter their negative emotional proclivities and interpretations of their physical states. People often take their stress reactions and tensions as signs of susceptibility to poor performance. In activities involving strength and stamina, people judge their fatigue, aches and pains as signs of physical debility. An important role is also played by mood in affecting people’s judgements of their personal efficacy. While positive mood enhances perceived self-efficacy; despairing mood diminishes it. Perception and interpretation of emotional and physical reactions are more important than their sheer intensity; for example, people possessing a high sense of efficacy are likely to perceive their state of affective arousal as an emerging facilitator of performance, whereas people preoccupied with self-doubts regard arousal as interfering with their performance. Thus, physiological indicators of efficacy play an influential role in health functioning and in activities requiring physical strength and stamina.

Although these experiences influence efficacy perceptions, it is the individual’s cognitive appraisal and integration of these experiences that ultimately determine self-efficacy. The efficacy beliefs regulate human functioning through four major processes. These are cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes which operate collectively rather than in isolation.

Efficacy beliefs affect the cognitive processes in various forms. Human behaviour, being purposive, is governed by forethought embodying valued goals. Self-appraisal of capabilities influences the personal goal setting. The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and the firmer is their commitment to them.
The actions to be undertaken in course of time are initially organized thoughts. Efficacy beliefs, which people hold, guide and shape the further course of action which people construct and rehearse. People holding high personal efficacy beliefs visualize success and this positively guides and supports them for performance. People who doubt their efficacy visualize failure and do things that can go wrong because it becomes very difficult to achieve anything while fighting self-doubts. The main thing is that thoughts facilitate in predicting events and to acquire skills to control those events which affect lives. All this can be most effectively done through effective cognitive processing of information that contains numerous uncertainties, doubts and complexities.

Wood and Bandura (1989) observed that in the most pressing situational demands, failures, a strong sense of efficacy is required to overcome these. Specially they observed that under most taxing circumstances people possessing low self-efficacy become more and more inconsistent in their analytic thinking and lower their aspirations resulting in poor performance in contrast to people who with a high robust sense of efficacy set high goals and achieve them with proud possession of their efficacy beliefs.

Self-regulation of motivation is the other area in which self-efficacy beliefs are said to be effective. It is seen that each and every action of an individual is the outcome of all the anticipations he holds while setting goals and planning a future course of action. In order to attain the set goals, the available resources are mobilized to the maximum. Human motivation is mostly cognitively generated and there are three different forms of cognitive motivators around which different theories have been developed. These three forms are –causal attributions, outcome experiences and
cognized goals. Efficacy beliefs are seen to be operative in all these types of cognitive motivation.

Another area where self-efficacy beliefs are effective is affective processes. It is the self-efficacy belief an individual possesses which determines how he or she copes with stressful and depressing situations.

The fourth area in which self-efficacy beliefs are said to be effective is selection process. People are partly the product of their environment and their efficacy beliefs can help them in choosing the type of activities and environments they wish to get into and, thus shaping the course that their lives take. People with a high sense of efficacy avoid activities and select environments they believe exceed their coping capabilities. But they readily undertake challenging activities and select environments they judge themselves capable of managing.

Those who have low sense of efficacy in given domains shy away from difficult tasks, which they view as personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, the obstacles they are likely to face and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They tend to decrease their effort and surrender easily in the face of difficulties and if they face setbacks then they are very slow to recover their sense of efficacy and easily fall prey to stress and depression.

In contrast to it, a person with a high sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. Such a person accepts difficult jobs as challenges to be mastered rather than threats to be avoided. Such ruminations and attitudes foster intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities.
They heighten and sustain his efforts in the face of difficulties and tend to quickly recover his sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks and attribute failure to insufficient effort or to deficient knowledge and skills that are acquirable.

Strong efficacy beliefs are not produced merely by verbal proclamations rather these are the product of a complex process of self-persuasion that relies on cognitive processing of diverse sources of efficacy information which once formed improve the quality of human life to a great extent.

Organizational psychologists have followed Bandura (1986) in focusing on specific self-efficacy (SSE), largely ignoring general self-efficacy (GSE). SSE is a situational specific cognition that is focused on a particular task. Studying it requires devising an ad hoc measure for each task; such measures are rarely used twice. Self-efficacy field researchers have measured and raised such narrowly focused SSE as, “attendance-self-efficacy”, “job seeking self-efficacy”, and “software self-efficacy”

Perceived self-efficacy is concerned with judgements of how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations. Competency belief can stem from many sources including attributions about the causes of previous attainments and perceptions of ability, adaptability, creativity and capacity for self-control. Perceived self-efficacy can be defined as an individual’s estimate of his or her capability of performing a specific set of actions required to deal with task-situations. Self-efficacy is hypothesized to be an important determinant of action and, therefore, given the appropriate level of skill, performance (Bandura, 1986).

According to Bandura, self-efficacy is causally related to action independently of the individual’s actual demonstrated ability on a task, even though the two are related. Thus, the same degree of actual success in performing a task can lead to
different degrees of experienced self-efficacy, because different individuals may reach
different conclusions from the same previous attainment. For example, one person
may succeed but not really feel in control of the task, because it was very hard or
because he or she felt very nervous, whereas another may find achieving the same
degree of success to be effortless. So, the subsequent performance of the task will
have the reflection of these different percepts of self-efficacy.

In order to illustrate the causal power of self-efficacy, Bandura and his
colleagues have conducted experiments in different settings. The level of
performance, task choice, effort, persistence and stress-reactions are found to be
influenced by this.

Self-efficacy is seen in helping people in exercising control over events that
affect their lives. People are able to realize desired goals and to forestall undesired
ones with the help of the process of exerting influence in spheres over which they can
exercise some control. There is a strong desire (longing) to have control over life-
circumstances and this desire permeates almost everything people do because it can
accompany innumerable personal and social benefits. The ability to affect outcomes
makes them predictable and this predictability results into adoptive preparedness,
whereas the inability to exert influence over things that adversely affect one’s life
breeds apprehension, apathy or despair. So, the capability to produce valued outcomes
and to prevent undesired ones provides powerful incentives for the development and
exercise of personal control.

Because of the centrality of control in human lives, various theories about self-
efficacy have been propounded over the years. People’s level of motivation, affective
states and actions are based more on what they believe in than on what is objectively
the case. Thus, the beliefs people hold for their causative capabilities are to be inquired and to fully understand the causative reason, origin, structure, function, effects and processes through which they operate should be studied. Self-efficacy theory addresses itself to all of these sub-processes both at the individual and collective level.

There has been a growing convergence of theory and research in recent years on the influential role of self-efficacy and self-referent thought in performance accomplishments and other outcome-related behaviours. Though, the researches have been undertaken from a number of different perspectives assuming a variety of names, yet the basic phenomenon being addressed to centres on people’s sense of personal efficacy to produce and to regulate events in their lives.

The variety of perspectives includes the mediating role of self-efficacy in the organizational performance, contribution to the prediction of vocational congruence, moderating effect on stress reactions, collective efficacy and working together at work-place, performance in sports and scholastic achievement.

Empirical studies of self-efficacy have yielded several consistent findings e.g., self-efficacy is associated with work-related performance: life insurance sales, faculty research productivity, coping with difficult career-related tasks, career choice and adaptability to new technology.

Bandura (1986) has also asserted that self-efficacy is significantly and positively related to future performance and extensive research strongly supports this claim. Besides, it is considered to be a significant variable in goal-setting theory. Over the past few years, research has demonstrated a clear connection between self-efficacy and behaviour. First, it has been found that self-efficacy influences our
choice of actions (Bandura, 1977). We avoid tasks we do not think we are up to, and choose those which we assume ourselves capable of accomplishing. It should be emphasized here that it is the expectations which have the effect—not our ability or lack of ability to cope with the task.

Second, self-efficacy affects the amount of energy we invest in a task, and the length of time during which we preserve without achieving the desired results (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Individuals with low self-efficacy invest less and give up sooner. Third, self-efficacy affects our performance. Tasks located within an experienced “area of confidence” are carried out successfully, while tasks outside it create problems (Bandura, 1977). Corresponding results have been demonstrated in a number of other experiments. Self-efficacy affects both motivation and performance.

1.4.1. TEACHER TRAINEES’ SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS

The interest in looking at teacher trainees’ teaching efficacy is due in part to the suggestion forwarded by Bandura that efficacy beliefs would be easily constructed in early stages of learning or training, and that once these efficacy beliefs are established, they are quite permanent and resistant to change.

Another reason is that the construct appears to have long-term implications which include aspects of interest to teacher education in general such as job satisfaction and length of a career in teaching. There is evidence to suggest that teacher training assignments and teaching practice have different influences on personal and general teaching efficacy of teacher trainees. General teaching efficacy beliefs are more likely to change when prospective teachers are exposed to vicarious learning experience and the many training tasks or assignments. Personal teaching
efficacy beliefs, on the other hand are strongly influenced by mastery learning, such as teaching practice experiences. It is also noted that at the same time, during teaching practice, general efficacy beliefs level would decline. The assumption is that realities and authentic classroom teaching experience had made the teacher trainees realize the many demands and challenges faced by teachers, and that teaching theories do not always cater for these classroom and instructional problems.

The research on self efficacy development suggests that efficacy judgments are most malleable in the early stages of mastering a skill and become more set with experience at least as long as the context and task remains relatively stable. So it makes sense that early teaching experiences would be important shapers of efficacy judgements. If these early experiences are positive, then new teachers are better able to persist in the face of the inevitable disappointments and discouragement of the first attempts at school teaching. On the other hand, unsuccessful early experiences in teaching can direct, teacher trainees away from the profession.

Learning style assessments provide teacher trainees an opportunity to learn how they are likely to respond under different circumstances and how to approach information in a way that best addresses our particular needs. The learning style assessment is found helpful in examining how we take in information through our senses. Researchers call these sorts of assessments “perceptual modality assessments”. They look at how we see, hear, feel and move through the world. These perceptions deeply affect our ability to learn.

By recognizing and understanding their learning styles, teacher trainees can use techniques better suited to them. This improves the speed and quality of their learning. This will enhance the self efficacy of teacher trainees. Teacher trainees with
a strong sense of efficacy tend to exhibit greater levels of planning, organization and enthusiasm. They tend to be more open to new ideas, more willing to experiment with new methods to better meet the needs of their students, and more committed to teaching. They persist when things do not go smoothly and are more resilient in the face of setbacks. So in order to adopt better teaching strategies, teacher trainees have to develop self efficacy.

1.5. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Knowledge attained or skills developed in the school subjects, usually designated by test scores or by marks assigned by teachers or by both (Good 1945).

As far as the B.Ed. curriculum is concerned, academic achievement refers to the marks that the trainees score for their theory papers and the practicals.

Achievement motive

The need to achieve is the spring board of the achievement motive. Achievement motive is as basic and natural as the other biological or socio-psychological needs. In a competitive society there is a stronger drive or motive to achieve something or everything that is essential to beat others in the race and consequently experience a sense of pride and pleasure in the achievement.

The need for achievement is stable, learned characteristic in which satisfaction is obtained by striving for and attaining a level of excellence. People, high in achievement motivation, are to choose tasks that are of intermediate difficulty.
1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Teacher education seeks to promote excellence, adventure of ideas and search for truth. Teacher education should help to develop those capabilities in a trainee which would help him to conceptualize a phenomenon or situation and enable him to contribute to social development through his knowledge and skills.

To be a successful teacher, the teacher trainee should be able to perceive and assess the emotions of his own students. Teachers’ belief in their personal efficacy to motivate and promote learning affects the types of learning environment they create and the level of academic progress their students achieve. There are several studies to prove that the teacher trainees’ academic achievement is positively correlated to their emotional intelligence. A lot of research had been done to prove the relationship between self efficacy and academic achievement of college students. Though studies have been made separately on emotional intelligence and academic achievement, and self efficacy and academic achievement, the investigator feels that an attempt to study the effect of emotional intelligence and self efficacy of B.Ed. trainees on their academic achievement has not been taken up so far. Hence the investigator has come up with the idea of undertaking a study in Kerala.

1.7. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“Effect of Emotional Intelligence and Self- Efficacy of B.Ed. trainees on their Academic Achievement”.
1.8. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Effect

This has the meaning of the result produced by a cause, influence or it is the power to change.

Emotional Intelligence

It is the kind of intelligence or the skill that involves the ability to perceive, assess and positively influence one’s own and other people’s emotions.

Self- Efficacy

It is one’s self judgement of personal capabilities to initiate and successfully perform specified tasks at designated levels, expand greater effort and persevere in the face of adversity.

B.Ed. trainees

B.Ed. trainees are the students who undergo pre-service training to teach in the secondary and higher secondary levels.

Academic Achievement

It is the knowledge attained or skills developed in the school subjects, usually designated by test scores or by marks assigned by teachers or by both (Good 1945). Academic achievement can be defined as excellence in all academic disciplines and co-curricular activities. In the present study, academic achievement is indicated by the
marks scored by the teacher trainees at the B.Ed. Degree Examination of the University of Kerala

1.9. OBJECTIVES

SECTION – I

1. To find out the level of self-efficacy and its dimensions of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution.

2. To find out the level of emotional intelligence and its dimensions of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution.

3. To find out the level of academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution.

SECTION II

4. To find out the significant difference in self-efficacy and its dimensions of B.Ed. trainees with regard to sex, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, qualification of the students and residence.
5. To find out the significant difference in emotional intelligence and its dimensions of B.Ed. trainees with regard to sex, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, qualification of the students and residence.

6. To find out the significant difference in academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to sex, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, qualification of the students and residence.

SECTION III

7. To find out the significant difference among the B.Ed. trainees of
   a. Different age group
   b. Different family income
   c. Different communities
   d. Institutions of different nature
   e. Different optional subjects
   on their self-efficacy and its dimensions.

8. To find out the significant difference among the B.Ed. trainees of
   a. Different age group
   b. Different family income
   c. Different communities
   d. Institutions of different nature
   e. Different optional subjects
   on their emotional intelligence and its dimensions.

9. To find out the significant difference among the B.Ed. trainees of
   a. Different age group
b. Different family income

c. Different communities

d. Institutions of different nature

e. Different optional subjects

on their academic achievement.

SECTION IV

10. To find out the significant relationship between self-efficacy-its dimensions-and academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution.

11. To find out the significant relationship between emotional intelligence-its dimensions-and academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution.
1.10. HYPOTHESES

SECTION I

1. The level of self-efficacy and its dimensions of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

2. The level of dimension of self-efficacy-efficacy in learning-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

3. The level of dimension of self-efficacy-efficacy in teaching-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

4. The level of dimension of self-efficacy-efficacy in facing the examination-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

5. The level of dimension of self-efficacy-efficacy in following the peer group members-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects
chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

6. The level of emotional intelligence and its dimensions of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

7. The level of dimension of emotional intelligence-intrapersonal awareness-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

8. The level of dimension of emotional intelligence-interpersonal awareness-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

9. The level of dimension of emotional intelligence-intrapersonal management-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

10. The level of dimension of emotional intelligence-interpersonal management-of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such
as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

11. The level of academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to the background variables such as sex, age, locality of the institution, nativity of the students, optional subjects chosen, qualification of the students, family income, community, residence and nature of the institution is average level.

SECTION II

12. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions between male and female trainees.

13. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions between the trainees of rural and urban institutions.

14. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions between rural and urban B.Ed. trainees.

15. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions between graduate and post graduate B.Ed. trainees.

16. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions between day scholar B.Ed. trainees and hosteler B.Ed. trainees.

17. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions between male and female trainees.

18. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions between the trainees of rural and urban institutions.
19. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions between rural and urban B.Ed. trainees.

20. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions between graduate and post graduate B.Ed. trainees.

21. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions between day scholar B.Ed. trainees and hosteler B.Ed. trainees.

22. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the academic achievement between (a) male and female B.Ed. trainees, (b) rural B.Ed. college trainees and urban B.Ed. college trainees, (c) rural and urban B.Ed. trainees, (d) graduate and post graduate B.Ed. trainees and (e) day scholar and hosteler B.Ed. trainees.

**SECTION III**

23. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different age group.

24. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different family income.

25. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different communities.

26. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of institutions of different nature.
27. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the self-efficacy and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different optional subjects.

28. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different age group.

29. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different family income.

30. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different communities.

31. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of institutions of different nature.

32. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the emotional intelligence and its dimensions among the B.Ed. trainees of different optional subjects.

33. There is no significant mean difference in the score on the academic achievement among the B.Ed. trainees of

   a. Different age group
   b. Different family income
   c. Different communities
   d. Institutions of different nature
   e. Different optional subjects
SECTION IV

34. There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy-its dimensions-and academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to (a) sex, (b) age, (c) locality of the institution, (d) nativity of the students, (e) optional subjects chosen, (f) qualification of the students, (g) family income, (h) community, (i) residence and (j) nature of the institution.

35. There is no significant relationship between emotional intelligence-its dimensions-and academic achievement of B.Ed. trainees with regard to (a) sex, (b) age, (c) locality of the institution, (d) nativity of the students, (e) optional subjects chosen, (f) qualification of the students, (g) family income, (h) community (i) residence and (j) nature of the institution.

1.11. POPULATION AND SAMPLE

A population is any group of individuals that have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher. The population may be all the individuals of a particular type or a more restricted part of the group. A sample is a small portion of population selected for observation and analysis.

In the present study the population is the B.Ed. trainees of the training colleges of the state of Kerala.

The total sample selected for the present study is 900 trainees belonging to the colleges that are affiliated to the University of Kerala.
1.12. TOOLS OF THE STUDY

The major tools of the study are:

(a) Personal Data Form

(b) Self-Efficacy Scale developed by the investigator

(c) Emotional Intelligence Inventory of Dr. S.K. Mangal.

1.13. DELIMITATION

In the State of Kerala, B.Ed. programme is offered by the University of Kerala, Mahatma Gandhi University, University of Calicut and Kannur University. The B.Ed. programme is offered in Government colleges, Government-Aided colleges, University colleges of teacher education and Self-Financing colleges. There are only four Government B.Ed. colleges in Kerala, and among that only one college is affiliated to the University of Kerala. So the trainees of the Government colleges are not included in this study. The study is limited to six Government-Aided colleges; seven University Colleges of Teacher Education, and seven Self-Financing colleges that are affiliated to the University of Kerala. The study is limited to the four districts namely Kollam, Alappuzha, Thiruvananthapuram and Pathanamthitta (Travancore districts of Kerala).