Influence of Self-Efficacy on Teacher Performance and Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Teachers from Different Teacher Education Programs

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

[1] Research Scholar, Lords University, Alwar

[2] Supervisor, Department of Education, Lords University, Alwar

Abstract - Specialists have recommended that fledgling teachers who have not invested energy in the classroom might rely more upon different contributions to shape their assumptions for future achievement .Intrinsic motivation and amotivation are two of the motivation factors that can influence procrastination. High procrastinators tend to have more amotivation and less intrinsic motivation, which suggests that students procrastinate because they lack the intrinsic intellectuality and innate psychological need for competence, or because they do not have a sense of purpose or direction in their lives. Neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion are some of the personality qualities that have been shown to have a role in procrastination. High procrastinators had higher levels of neuroticism and agreeableness and lower levels of extraversion and conscientiousness. Laziness and poor time management were determined to be the two most common causes of academic procrastination, despite the fact that there was no difference between the causes of procrastination reported by males and females. In any case, no researcher in India has conducted a systematic study on the influence of gender and academic achievement on the self-efficacy, thinking, and dynamic styles of imminent pre-service teachers as a whole.

Keywords - Self-Efficacy , Teacher, Performance , Education , Programs, Satisfaction

- *X* -

INTRODUCTION

The impact and significance of the idea of self-efficacy, which is characterized as the full of feeling aspect of learning in the writing, in the learning system is stressed (Tekerek, Ercan, Udum, and Saman, 2012). In this association, having innovative self-efficacy somewhere out there training process is significant as far as the adequacy and effectiveness of the interaction (Ekici, Ekici, and Kara, 2012). Self-efficacy conviction, which was first presented inside the extent of Bandura's Social Learning Theory and later considered as a significant variable in many examinations in various fields, is an idea connected with the individual decisions of people concerning how well they can play out the activities important to adapt to potential circumstances (Bandura, 1982). Whenever it is considered somewhere out there schooling process, it significantly affects inspiration, execution and learning results (Bixler, 2006), and it shows up as a significant variable to be considered during the time spent gathering assumptions from distance training. It is expressed that innovation information somewhere out there instruction process is viable on understudy demeanor and the viability of the learning system

(Kırmacı and Acar, 2018; Sakal, 2017). In this unique circumstance, one more variable to be considered somewhere far off training process is understudy mentalities. As indicated by Ogunniyi (2015), demeanor should be visible as the amount of understudies' encounters about and propensities towards the learning system. Knowing the perspectives of understudies towards the distance training interaction will empower the powerful association and utilization of distance schooling conditions.

Self-Efficacy

It is relevant to specify that the development of self-efficacy beliefs starts to shape in youth that doesn't end during youth, however keeps on advancing all through life as individuals obtain new abilities, encounters and comprehension. People"s conviction about their efficacy can be created by four principle sources of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; 2000). These sources are clarified as under:

1. **Mastery Experiences**: The experience of mastery is the main source in deciding self-

efficacy. Fruitful experiences raises self-efficacy while disappointment subverts it especially in the event that disappointments happen before a feeling of efficacy is solidly settled. In the event that individuals have been fruitful at a specific ability in the past they will be effective in the expertise in future.

2. **Vicarious Experiences**: The second wellspring of making and fortifying self-efficacy is through the vicarious experiences given by social models. It implies improvement of high or low self-efficacy vicariously through other people"s exhibitions. It is additionally called as displaying which is insight as "Assuming they can get it done, I can do it too". Whenever individuals see somebody succeeding, their own self-efficacy increments, when individuals see others bombing their self-efficacy diminishes. Demonstrating is a solid cycle when we see ourselves as like the model. Despite the fact that, it isn't quite so persuasive as immediate/mastery experiences yet it is especially helpful for individuals who are especially uncertain of themselves.

3. **Social Persuasions**: The third wellspring of fortifying people"s beliefs which for the most part appears as immediate support or debilitation from someone else, for instance, educator can increment students" self-efficacy with valid correspondence and feedback or persuade them to put forth their best attempt. Albeit, social influence can be compelling yet it doesn't contribute as much as an individual"s own experiences. It could be because of the way that unreasonable lifts in efficacy are rapidly disconfirmed by frustrating aftereffects of one"s endeavors. The transient impacts of social influence should be combined with real triumphs.

4. **Physiological Feedback**: The last source whereupon individuals can secure their self-efficacy is physiological feedback. Individuals depend on their physiological signals and passionate state in making a decision about their capacities. In upsetting circumstances, individuals usually display indications of trouble, hurts, torments, exhaustion, dread and sickness and so on They decipher these pressure responses and strains as an indication of weakness to lackluster showing. Positive disposition expands self-efficacy while gloomy temperament diminishes.

Contributors to Teacher Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1993) proposed four sources of data which add to the arrangement of self-efficacy beliefs, including mastery experiences, verbal feedback, vicarious experiences, and physiological and enthusiastic excitement because of an encounter. As indicated by Bandura, mastery experiences are the most grounded wellspring of data that adds to self-efficacy beliefs, since they permit one to associate genuine encounters to conceivable future results.

Assuming one accepts that one has gotten done with a responsibility effectively, self-efficacy is expanded, and a precedent is laid out from which future assumptions for progress can be drawn. Then again, an impression of not accomplishing mastery on an errand can prompt brought down self-efficacy and future assumptions for disappointment.

In view of these discoveries, our model for pre-service instructor self-efficacy guesses that great educating during understudy instructing will serve as amastery experience, resulting in higher self-efficacy for the people who experience achievement. A few late papers have likewise inspected the impact of setting, set to be a blend of individual elements of teachers and highlights of the classroom, on teachers' self-efficacy beliefs (Guo, Justice, Sawyer, and Tompkins, 2011; Tschannen-Moran and Johnson, 2011) and tracked down huge connections. The trouble in making an interpretation of these discoveries to the self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers is that they don't yet have many educating experiencesfrom which to draw data, or a classroom climate where to arrange their future assumptions.

Specialists have recommended that fledgling teachers who have not invested energy in the classroom might rely more upon different contributions to shape their assumptions for future achievement (Tschannen-Moran and Johnson, 2011;Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy, 1998), yet there is little lucidity on what those data sources may be The current review intends to address this hole in the writing by drawing on Rimm-Kaufman and Hamre's (in press) as of late proposed Comprehensive Model of Teacher Quality which features the significance of concentrating on teachers as creating individuals and thinking about the significance of their basic mental traits (e.g., character, feelings, perspectives, mental capacity, beliefs) in clarifying varieties between teachers. Despite the fact that a large group of mental characteristics might actually be related with pre-service educator self-efficacy, for the motivations behind thisstudy we have decided to focusspecifically on two central credits which underlie the choices that teachers make in the classroom and how the occasions of their classroom are interpreted: teachers' character and their beliefs about kids' turn of events and learning.

- **Gender Differences**

In Levels Of Self Esteem Women have regularly been normal and marked as being more enthusiastic than men. This area of gender differences is vital to investigate, as self-esteem or self picture that envelop gender may likewise incorporate the self-cognizant feelings or propensities related with gender (Bhardwaj and Agrawal, 2013). Ladies, for instance, are relied upon to show more culpability, disgrace and humiliation though men are charged to show more pride, yet research shows that ladies truth be told do show more responsibility, disgrace

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

and shame than men however that people show a similar measure of pride (Else-Quest et al., 2012).

Previous examination on gender differences in self-esteem proposes that male teenagers have higher self-esteem than female youths do (Chubb et al., 1997; Eccles et al., 1989; Labouvie et al.,1990; McMullin and Cairney, 2004; Moksnes, Moljord, Espnes, and Byrne, 2010; Robins et al., 2002; Roeser and Eccles, 1998; Twenge and Campbell, 2001; Young and Mroczek, 2003); in any case, in certain investigations the gender contrast was little (Kling, Hyde, Showers, and Buswell, 1999; Quatman, Sampson, Robinson, and Watson, 2001) or nonsignificant (Keltikangas-Ja¨rvinen, 1990). In like manner, a few examinations detailed higher self-esteem for men in youthful adulthood (McMullin and Cairney, 2004; Robins et al., 2002; Twenge and Campbell, 2001), albeit in certain investigations the gender contrast was little (Orth et al., 2010; Robins, Hendin, and Trzesniewski, 2001) or nonsignificant (Donnellan et al., 2007; Galambos et al., 2006).

- **Differences between the sexes in the classroom**

Patterns of behaviour, attitudes, and expectations that are linked with a certain sex, such as being male or female, are what are referred to as gender roles. In the sake of clarity, psychologists may occasionally differentiate between gender differences, which are associated with social roles, and sex differences, which are exclusively associated with physiology and anatomy. If we use this language, we may say that gender is a more important factor in teaching than sex (despite any jokes that may be said about the latter!).

- **The gender roles are physically distinct from one another.**

Boys are often more energetic than females, and as a result, they might become antsy and fidgety if they are required to stay still for extended periods of time. They are also more likely to resort to physical violence when they are frustrated, in contrast to the behaviour of girls (Espelage & Swearer, 2004). Even for boys who are never actually in trouble for being restless or aggressive, there is a slightly increased likelihood that school will be a challenging experience for them because both tendencies are inconsistent with the typical demands of classroom life. This makes it a little more likely that school will be a difficult experience for boys.

Gross motor abilities tend to progress at a pace that is virtually identically typical for both boys and girls throughout the first two or three years of elementary school. In general, people of both sexes have roughly the same level of ease when it comes to activities like running, jumping, throwing a ball, and other similar activities; but, there are of course huge and substantial disparities between individuals of both sexes. However, by the conclusion of primary school, males

have surpassed girls in these abilities, despite the fact that neither sexe has yet began the process of puberty. The most plausible explanation for this phenomenon is that males are subject to greater pressure and get more support in the form of expectations and competition from their parents, friends, and society as a whole (Braddock, Sokol-Katz, Greene, & Basinger-Fleischman, 2005; Messner, Duncan, & Cooky, 2003). The process of puberty ultimately makes males taller and stronger than girls, on average, and hence more suitable for sports that depend on height and strength. This advantage is eventually added to by the process of puberty.

Self-Efficacy and Effective Teacher Education Programs

The important capabilities by which a pre-service teacher will figure out how to turn into a viable teacher in what's to come are accomplished through teacher education programsî (Temiz and Topcu, 2013, p. 1435). Qualities of teacher education programs like length of field positions, the connection between the college and the locale where the teacher-competitor is set, the schoolís environment and the general acknowledgment of the pre-service teacher inside that environment, can affect the learning system and the accomplishment of that up-and-comer (Hascher and Kittinger, 2014) According to Klassen et al. (2013) teacher education projects should address the pressure experienced by pre-service teachers and spotlight on creating strategies to deal with that pressure. Kim and Cho (2012) accept that powerful teacher education projects ought to prepare understudies to be resilient and have high self-efficacy by building fruitful showing partners so pre-service teachers can share their showing experiences and, address the issue of reality shock.

An investigation of teacher education programs by Ronfeldt, Schwartz and Jacob (2014) proposes that teacher education projects can improve pre-service teacher preparedness and effect the future achievement of those pre-service teachers by expanding the time they spend in the classroom. One more concentrate by Hung and Waxman (2009) proposes that the school where understudy teachers are set is significant and matters as far as fulfillment of the understudy teacher and that future teacherís obligation to the calling. This is significant in light of the fact that, as indicated by Ciani, Summers and Easter (2008), a strong climate where a pre-service teacher experiences a positive teacher local area might assist with reinforcing their self-efficacy. As per Knoblauch and Chase (2015) despite the fact that examination demonstrates that teacher education programs should have numerous field arrangements in assorted settings like high minority, high-neediness, ghetto schools, there is little proof of pre-service teachersí ability to be self aware efficacy as it connects with these settings. A mid-western college as a team with a nearby school locale,

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

fostered a drawn out understudy showing program intended to help pre-service teachers foster connections that would prompt a more grounded feeling of efficacy. Teacher competitors were put in high-destitution low-pay schools where extra help was required.

- **Job Satisfaction And Job Stress**

In spite of reports of undeniable levels of teachers' work pressure (Chaplain, 2008; Schwarzer and Hallum, 2008), numerous teachers track down private fulfillment in their work. Work fulfillment view of satisfaction got from everyday work exercises is related with more significant levels of occupation execution (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton, 2001). Caprara et al. (2003) considered work fulfillment a "unequivocal component" (p. 823) affecting teachers' mentalities and execution and viewed self-efficacy as a significant supporter of teachers' work fulfillment. Teachers report that work fulfillment is acquired from the idea of everyday classroom exercises, for example, working with kids, seeing understudies make improvement, working with steady partners, and generally school environment (Cockburn and Haydn, 2004).

Teachers who are disappointed with their work show lower responsibility and are at more serious gamble for leaving the calling (Evans, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001). Liu and Ramsey (2008) observed that pressure from unfortunate work conditions had the most grounded effect on teachers' work fulfillment and noticed that lacking time for arranging and preparation and a weighty showing responsibility diminished fulfillment from instructing. Educating may bring individual fulfillment, yet it additionally brings pressure, with requests from managers, associates, understudies, and guardians compounded by work over-burden, understudy mischief, and an absence of acknowledgment for achievements (Greenglass and Burke, 2003).

Teachers with more prominent teacher stress-characterized as the experience of gloomy feelings coming about because of a teacher's work.(Kyriacou, 2001)- have lower self-efficacy (Betoret, 2006; Schwarzer and Hallum, 2008; Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2007), more unfortunate teacher-understudy affinity, and lower levels of adequacy (Abel and Sewell, 1999; Kokkinos, 2007). Teachers with significant degrees of occupation stress might acquire fulfillment from work, however the degree of fulfillment might be quieted by pressure from job uncertainty, low independence, or recurrence or level of contention with understudies and associates (Greenglass and Burke, 2003). Showing has been recorded among the highstress callings, with upwards of one-fourth of teachers detailing that instructing is an extremely upsetting position (Kyriacou, 2001). While previous investigations have conceptualized teachers' work pressure as a unidimensional build (for example Schwarzer and Hallum, 2008), different investigations have shown that responsibility and understudy rowdiness (i.e.,

classroom factors) contribute independently to teachers' general pressure (Boyle, Borg, Falzon, and Baglioni, 1995). Teachers with undeniable degrees of stress from these two sources show higher pessimistic wellbeing and professional results, including burnout (passionate depletion, depersonalization, and diminished individual achievement), truancy, and exit from the showing calling (Betoret, 2006; Jepson and Forrest, 2006; Kyriacou, 2001).

Teacher Characteristics

Teaching level and teacher gender are connected with teachers' jobrelated beliefs. Grade teachers report more significant levels of self-efficacy for understudy commitment than teachers in center or secondary schools (Wolters and Daugherty, 2007). Liu and Ramsey (2008) observed that ladies experience less work fulfillment than men, particularly fulfillment from work conditions, and various scientists have noticed that female teachers report higher pressure than male teachers (e.g., Antoniou, Polychroni, and Vlachakis, 2006; Chaplain, 2008), conceivably because of more elevated levels of in general responsibility (Greenglass and Burke, 2003). While Klassen et al. (2009) observed comparative relationships between self-efficacy and occupation fulfillment for teachers from five North American and Asian nations, results from different investigations propose that teachers' ethnicity and related social beliefs can impact the relationships among work pressure, work fulfillment, and teachers' efficacy (Klassen, Usher, and Bong, in press; Liu and Ramsey, 2008). Models clarifying teacher inspiration should account for individual beliefs and inspiration as well as for teacher attributes like teaching level, teaching experience, gender, and segment factors like teachers' social or public foundation.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study on Contributors to Teacher Self-Efficacy
2. To study on Self-Efficacy and Effective Teacher Education Programs

RESEARCH METHOD

Research is a process that is both well planned and based on scientific principles that may be used to discover answers to a broad range of situations. In the context of what is meant by the term "research," an effort is made to find a solution to a problem by collecting several kinds of data and conducting an in-depth, methodical investigation of the numerous facets of the problems that are involved.

Population

The term "population" refers to the complete group from which a representative sample is taken. In this particular instance, the target demographic consists of all of the B.Ed. College students in Himachal Pradesh. However, the population that is available

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

comes from the private B.Ed. institutes that are associated with Himachal Pradesh University.

VARIABLES

Independent variables These are referred to as input variables or stimulus variables. They may exert their effect on a person's conduct by acting either inside that individual or within the environment in which he lives. These are the elements that are measured, modified, or chosen by the investigator in order to discover how they are related to a certain occurrence that has been observed. In the current investigation, gender and academic success served as the research's independent variables. Dependent Variables These are also sometimes referred to as output or response variables. These are the aspects of the situation that are scrutinized and evaluated in order to ascertain how the independent variables have an impact. There were four different things that depended on other things. These were different ways of thinking and making decisions, as well as levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Tools Employed

The following research tools were chosen for usage, and these are those that were employed for the data gathering.

1. Self-Efficacy: The General Self-Efficacy scale was established by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (2019), and it measures a person's confidence in their own abilities (to be adapted by the investigator).
2. One's own sense of self-worth, as measured by the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, created by Morris Rosenberg (2019). (the investigator is free to make any necessary changes).
3. Thinking style refers to the thirteen different ways of thinking that were identified and quantified by Sternberg and Wagner in their Thinking Style Inventory (2017). (the investigator is free to make any necessary changes).

Table 1 The test-retest reliability index of the adapted version of the general self-efficacy scale was calculated using a two-week interval (N=120).

Co-efficient of correlation for the scores of Two Adapted version of General Self-Efficacy Scale	
First administration of Adapted Version of GSES	r = .706**
Second administration of Adapted Version of GSES	

** Statistically significant at the.01 level of confidence

The coefficient of correlation was found to be fairly high and significantly positive, as shown in table 1. This indicates that the modified version had a high degree of dependability for those who are interested in teaching in secondary schools. The General Self-Efficacy Scale, in both its original form and in a modified English translation, may be found in Appendix-A.

- ## The Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale

In 2019, Rosenberg devised a questionnaire called the Rosenberg self-esteem Questionnaire. The number of things on the scale is rather large. Wording that is good for half of the things contrasts with wording that is negative for the other half of the items. In order to lessen the impact of respondent set, the sequence in which the positive and negative questions were given was randomised. On a scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, each question received a score out of a possible four points. There was only one connection between each item and the self-acceptance component of self-esteem; none of the other connections were significant. The reproducibility coefficient for Rosenberg's scale was found to be 0.92 by Rosenberg (2019). A scale consisting of ten questions that assesses an individual's overall sense of self-worth by gauging both positive and negative thoughts about the individual. It is considered that there is just one dimension to the scale. A Likert scale with four points is used to rate each item in the survey. Format that ranges from strongly agreeing to strongly disagreeing with the statement. Ones numbered 1, 3, 4, 7, and 10 are seen as positive, whilst items numbered 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9 are regarded as negative. The score was SA = 3, A = 2, D = 1, and SD = 0. Items denoted with an asterisk have their scores calculated in the other direction: SA = 0, A = 1, D = 2, and SD = 3. Compute the total score based on all ten factors. The higher the score, the greater the individual's sense of their own worth. Scores lower than 15 are indicative of poor self-esteem.

- ## Adapted Thinking Styles Inventory

A revised version of sixty-five items The TSI was crafted by the investigator, and it was presented to the three educators for review in order to ensure that both the language and the substance of the statement were accurate. Statements were kept because there was complete consensus in favour of doing so. The investigator was responsible for making any necessary changes to any statements that required them. It is possible to state in this section that in the beginning of the TSI, a five-point Likert scale was used rather than a seven-point Likert scale. There is a copy of the modified version included in Appendix-A3, which you may get here. An effort was made to assess its concurrent validity by delivering both the English and Adapted versions of the test to the same sample. The sample consisted of 120 individuals and was drawn at random from two universities that provide the Bachelor of Education degree. Before the subjects were given the inventory, the relevant instructions

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

were provided to them, and they were directed to respond using an objective five-point scale. This was done before the administration of the inventory. An interval of ten minutes was provided in between the administration of the two different forms of the TSI. After finishing up with both of the tools, scoring was carried out with the assistance of the standard key. The information that was gathered may be found in the "Appendix-B" that has been supplied. The product moment technique developed by Pearson was used to calculate the correlation between the two different sets of scores. Table 2 has a report on this information.

Table 2 Validity of the Concurrent Use of the Adapted Version of the Thinking Style Inventory (N=60)

Thinking Style	Co-efficient o? Correlation for scores of Adapted and English b'ersion of TSI
Legislative	.736""
Executive	.652*"
Judicial	.77 I "*
Global	.7?8**
Local	.721 *"
Liberal	.6'7S**
Conservative	.792**
Hierarchic	.695-""
Monarchic	.5? 1**
Oligarchic	.7?5"*
Anarchic	.523**
Internal	.772**
External	.724""

** At the.01 level of significance, the results are significant.

It is clear from looking at table 2 that it was determined that the estimated concurrent validity for each kind of thinking style was highly significant at the.01 level. Because of this, the concurrent validity of the modified version of TS1 was deemed to be pretty adequate. In addition, test-retest reliability was demonstrated for the modified version of TSI using a time gap of two weeks between the two tests. The TSI, in conjunction with the appropriate teaching, was given to one hundred twenty B.Ed. students who were chosen at random from two universities.

DATA ANALYSIS

Table 3 Identifying descriptive statistics for the motivation derived from extraneous sources.

Non-academic Procrastinators	Academic Procrastinator	
	Low	High
Low	N= 432	N=432
	M=21.8	M=19.92
	SD=4.69	SD=5.17
High	N=468	N=468
	M=20.6	M=19.34
	SD=4.56	SD=5.19

Table 4 Comparison of the means and standard deviations for high and low levels of academic and nonacademic procrastination for extrinsic motivation that was discovered.

Variables	Levels	N	M	SD
Academic Procrastination	High	200	19.63	5.16
	Low	200	21.20	4.6
Non-academic Procrastination	High	300	20.00	4.94
	Low	200	20.87	4.94

The mean ratings and standard deviations for extrinsically motivated individuals are shown in Table 4. The comparisons of means and standard deviations for extrinsic motivation that were found in connection to academic and non-academic procrastination are shown in Table 4. On the topic of extrinsic motivation – recognised, the table demonstrates that the mean score of high academic procrastinators is lower (M=19.63, SD=5.16) than the mean score of low academic procrastinators (M=21.20, SD=4.62). It can be seen from the mean score that high academic procrastinators fall into the average category on extrinsic motivation –identified, whereas low academic procrastinators are high on extrinsic motivation –identified. This can be contrasted with low academic procrastinators who are high on extrinsic motivation –identified. In a similar manner, the mean score of high non-academic procrastinators (M=20.00, SD=4.94) is lower than the mean score of low non-academic procrastinators (M=20.87, SD=4.94), and both groups stand average on the extrinsic motivation-identified scale.

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

Table 5 Table of the ANOVA Results for Extrinsic Motivation That Was Identified.

Source A (AcademicProcrastination)	SS 376.33	Df 1	MS 376.33	F 15.77**
B(Non-academic	114.59	1	114.59	4.80*
Procrastination)				
AxB	13.19	1	13.19	0.55ns
Withincell	14218.75	596	23.86	

**p< 0.01, η 2 =0.025).

In addition to this, the F-ratio between high and low non-academic procrastinators on Extrinsic Motivation– Identified is significant (F (1,596) =4.80, p 0.05, 2 =0.0077). The AB interaction is not statistically significant.

Table 6 Presented below are some descriptive data on extrinsic motivation.

Non-academic Procrastinators	Academic Low	Procrastinators High
Low	N=432	N=432
	M=16.65	M=16.70
	SD=5.76	SD=5.51
High	N=468	N=468
	M=16.13	M=15.12
	SD=5.40	SD=6.25

Table 7 comparison of the means and standard deviations on academic (high-low) and nonacademic (high-low) procrastination for extrinsic incentive that was introduced:

Variables	Levels	N	M	SD
Academic	High	200	15.91	5.90
Procrastination	Low	200	16.39	5.58
Non-academic	High	300	15.64	5.81
Procrastination	Low	200	16.70	5.62

The mean and standard deviation for the value of intrinsic vs extrinsic motivation are shown in Table 7. Table 4.18 demonstrates that students who are high academic procrastinators have lower levels of extrinsic motivation introjected (M=15.91, SD=5.90) compared to students who are low academic procrastinators (M=16.39, SD=5.58), despite the fact that both groups are average in terms of extrinsic motivation-introjected. In a similar vein, high non-academic procrastinators have lower levels of extrinsic motivation when compared to low non-academic procrastinators (M=15.64, SD=5.81), whereas low non-academic procrastinators have higher levels of extrinsic motivation when compared to low non-academic procrastinators (M=16.70, SD=5.62) However, both groups are, According to the ANOVA summary found in table 8, which compares high and low academic procrastinators in relation to extrinsic motivation– introjected, high and low academic procrastinators do not differ in relation to extrinsic motivation–introjected.

On the other hand, high and low non-academic procrastinators differ significantly (F (1,596) =5.18, p 0.05, 2 =0.0020) in relation to ex The AB interaction is not statistically significant.

Table 8 Table of the results of the ANOVA for extrinsic incentive that is introduced.

Source	SS	df	MS	F
A(Academic	32.05	1	32.05	-0.98ns
Procrastination)	-	-	-	-
B(Non-academic	169.41	1	169.41	5.18*
Procrastination)	-	-	-	-
AxB	40.21	1	40.21	1.23ns
Withincell	19491.14	596	32.70	

*p<0.05, ns=non-Significant

Table 9 Statistics providing a descriptive account of extrinsic incentive achieved by external control.

Non-academic Procrastinators		Academic Low	Procrastinators High
	Low	N= 432	N=432
		M=21.72	M=20.94
		SD=5.50	SD=5.29
	High	N=468	N=468
		M=20.55	M=20.72
		SD=5.36	SD=5.79

CONCLUSION

For the purpose of providing a concise summary of the results of the overall study, it is possible to state that the current research made substantial contributions to the subject of procrastination in general and academic procrastination in particular. It has been found that high academic procrastinators and low academic procrastinators differ in their non-academic procrastination tendencies. This finding highlights the fact that procrastination is a habit that causes an individual to delay performing tasks or initiating a task regardless of the field, academic or non-academic. Intrinsic motivation and amotivation are two of the motivation factors that can influence procrastination. High procrastinators tend to have more amotivation and less intrinsic motivation, which suggests that students procrastinate because they lack the intrinsic intellectuality and innate psychological need for competence, or because they do not have a sense of purpose or direction in their lives. Neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion are some of the personality qualities that have been shown to have a role in procrastination. High procrastinators had higher levels of neuroticism and agreeableness and lower levels of extraversion and conscientiousness. Laziness and poor time management were determined to be the two most common causes of academic procrastination, despite the fact that there

Pramod S[1]*, Dr. Devendra Kumar[2]

was no difference between the causes of procrastination reported by males and females. In countries outside of the United States, significant efforts have been made to concentrate independently on the self-efficacy, self-esteem dynamic, and considering styles of pre service teachers in relation to the culture, socio-financial foundation, age, grade, individual, and mental quality of their students. In any case, no researcher in India has conducted a systematic study on the influence of gender and academic achievement on the self-efficacy, thinking, and dynamic styles of imminent pre-service teachers as a whole. This is the case despite the fact that this topic has been extensively studied in other countries. As a result, the current investigation is an unpretentious attempt at filling the gap in the existing study on self-efficacy, self-esteem, thinking styles, and dynamic styles.

REFERENCES

1. Ramazan Cansoy (2017)"Examining the Relationship between Pre-Service Teachers' Critical Thinking Disposition, Problem Solving Skills and Teacher Self-Efficacy"International Education Studies; Vol. 10, No. 6; 2017 ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039.
2. Dr. Aashiq Ahmad Thoker (2018)"Occupational Efficacy of Secondary School Teachers with Special Reference to Type of School"IJSRD - International Journal for Scientific Research & Development| Vol. 6, Issue 04, 2018 | ISSN (online): 2321-0613
3. Zangenehvandi, M., Farahian, M., & Gholami, H. (2019). On the relationship between EFLteachers'critical thinking and self-efficacy. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 4(2), 286-293.
4. Robert, M. (2010). Effects on Teachers Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction: Teacher Gender, Years of Experience, and Job Stress. Journal of Educational Psychology, American Psychological Association, Vol. 102. No. 3. Pp. 741–756
5. Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2021). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. Review of Educational Research, 20(10), 1-35.
6. Yasmin J., Rashmi C. & Mahima C. (2019). Relationship between Employees Self-Efficacy Belief and Role Stress. (Unpublished Ph. D Thesis), Department of Business Management. University of Horticulture and Forestry Nauni, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India
7. Srisawad, K., Ratanaolarn, T., & Kıddee, K. (2016). The development of structural equation model of critical thinking among nursing students. Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST), 14(1), 65-73.
8. Ambrosetti, A., & Dekkers, J. (2010) The Interconnectedness of the roles of mentors and mentees in pre-service teacher education mentoring relationships. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 42ñ55.
9. Winston, K. A. & Kwesi, N. W. (2019). Teachers' Selfefficacy on School Improvement: A Comparative Analysis of Private and Public Junior High Schools in the Takoradi. US-China Education Review B. Vol. 3. No. 12. Pp. 903-913.
10. Nosich, M. N. (2012). Eleştirel düşünme ve disiplinlerarası eleştirel düşünme rehberi (Çev. Birsel Aybek).
11. Neha, J. (2014). The Effect of Job Value on Occupational Self Efficacy of Secondary School Teachers. Journal for Interdisplanairy Approach, Vol. 2. No. 4. Pp. 332.
12. Neha, J. (2014). The Effect of Job Value on Occupational Self Efficacy of Secondary School Teachers. Journal for Interdisplanairy Approach, Vol. 2. No. 4. Pp. 332

Corresponding Author

Pramod S*

Research Scholar, Lords University, Alwar