Accountability of Management and Teachers of Self-Financing and Government-Aided Degree Colleges

Dr. Shikha Chaturvedi
Associate Professor, Department of Education
N.A.S. College, Meerut

Abstract

The central problem of the investigation is accountability of degree colleges. Higher education is the symbol of nation's progress and development. The higher education system in India has grown in a remarkable way, particularly in the post independent period, to become one of the largest systems of its kind in the world. However, the system has many issues of concern at present like financing and management including access, equity and relevance, reorientation of programs by laying emphasis on health consciousness, values and ethics and cp,4ality of higher education together with the assessment of institutions and their accreditation. These issues are important for the country, as it is engaged in the use of higher education as a powerful tool to build knowledge based information society of 21' century. Managing higher education institutions in India is just like a junction, how to show the path to the future nation builder of our country. There are very hue and cry situations and difficulties in present Indian higher education about what to do and what not to do. It becomes so sensitive that that it creates conflict in inter and intra management of higher education institutions. In recent years, there have been debates and controversies regarding management of higher education institutions so as to improve their efficiency. And this has attracted the attention of academics and researchers in the field of higher education. The present research article is a comparative study of accountability of management and teachers of self-financing and government-aided degree colleges.

Introduction:

The standard of education in India, as in other country depends, above all things, on the quality and competence of teachers. It is true to say that teacher is the heart of every educational institution and success of institutions is the attainment of educational goals depends largely on the quality and performance of its teachers. In fact, teacher is the most significant factor in the learning environment by the institution.

The secondary education commission said, "We are, however, convinced that the most important factor in the contemplated educational reconstruction is the teacher — his personal qualities, his educational qualifications, his professional training and place that he occupies in the school as well as in the community. The reputation of a school and its influence on the life of the community invariably depends on the kind of teachers working in it. Priority of consideration must, therefore, be given to the various problems concerned with the improvement of their status."

A teacher, devoted to his role writes the history and builds the nation. The teacher in modern time, has multiple roles to perform. His role is not confined to the classroom or towards his pupils only. He is accountable to wards school administrators, guardians -the community and towards the nation. All these have several expectations from the teaching community.

Accountability is a concept in ethics with several meanings. It is often used synonymously with such concepts as answerability, enforcements, responsibility, blameworthiness, liability, and other terms associated with the expectation of account giving. Increased accountability with higher education became a prominent issue in the 1980s. Accountability issues in the 1990s were expanded to include productively and various measures of institutional effectiveness.

Along with the focus on accountability comes pressure to adopt "the business model" with its greater emphasis on "the bottom line", such an emphasis reflects a market-driven approach to higher education rather than the historic roles and mission of institutions of higher learning. Educational institutions will undoubtedly continue to feel a demand for accountability.

The phenomenon under study is accountability of teachers and management of higher education. It has been assumed that extent of degree of accountability among teachers vary from person to person. It would, therefore, be both interesting and instructive to gauge the influence of social and academic characteristics of teachers on their accountability. Some characteristics of institutions may also influence the accountability of management. Hence the following such characteristics have been selected as independent variables : nature of the institutions, type of the institutions and area of the institutions.

Objectives:

The study has been designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To study the Accountability of management of self-financing degree colleges.
2. To study the Accountability of management of government-aided degree colleges.
3. To compare the Accountability of management of self-financing and government-aided degree colleges.
4. To study the Accountability of teachers of self-financing degree colleges.
5. To study the Accountability of teachers of government-aided degree-colleges.
6. To compare the Accountability of teachers of self-financing and government-aided degree colleges.

Hypotheses:

The following hypotheses have been formulated in this study:

1. There is no significant difference between the Accountability of management of self-financing and government-aided degree colleges.
2. There is no significant difference between the Accountability of teachers in self-financing and government-aided degree colleges.

Definitions of the terms used:

Accountability

Accountability refers to the accountability of management and teachers of degree colleges in their specific area.

Teachers

Teachers refer to those who are teaching in different colleges affiliated to C.C.S. University, Meerut.

Management

Management refers to the secretary, president and other executive members of a degree college.

Procedure of drawing Sample:

After selecting the colleges, 400 teachers of these colleges have been selected in total. Teachers from each college have been selected randomly for the survey according to their availability. There are 50 government-aided degree colleges affiliated to Chaudhary

Charan Singh University. Out of these colleges 38 are co-educational and 12 are female colleges. The number of Self-financing degree colleges affiliated to Chuadhary Charan Singh University is 342. The list of 342 Self-financing colleges contains 301 co-educational colleges and 41 female colleges.

Managerial personnel from each college has been surveyed for the study purpose. It is either the secretary of the college, president, manager, or any member of the executive committee of the college. Thus, the total no. of management sample is 50.

A total no. of 200 teachers have been taken as a sample from self-financing degree colleges and 200 from the government-aided degree colleges. Thus the total no. of teachers is 400. Out of these teachers 204 teachers teach in colleges situated in urban area and 196 teachers teach in colleges of rural area. Further, 260 teachers teach in male colleges and 140 in female colleges.

. For the management accountability 50 colleges were taken as sample. Out of theses colleges, 30 colleges were self-financing and 20 were government-aided degree colleges. 24 colleges were situated in urban area and 26 were situated in rural area. Out of these 50 colleges, 32 colleges were male colleges and 18 colleges were female colleges.

Variables involved:

The variables involved in the study have been categorized as follows:

Independent Variables -

1. Nature of the College (Self-financing or Government-aided)
2. Area of the College (Rural or Urban)
3. Type of College (Male or Female)

Dependent Variables —

1. Accountability of Teachers
2. Accountability of Management

Tools used:

For measuring the above mentioned variables two tools have been used.

1. **Teacher's Role Commintment Scale (TRCS)** prepared by Dr. Meena Buddhisagar Rathod and Madhulika Varma was used to measure the accountability of teachers.
2. **Scale for Degree Colleges Management Accountability** was constructed by researcher herself and was used to measure the accountability of management.

Data Organization:

After collecting the data through the above mentioned tools, scoring was made accordingly. The scores have been classified according to their independent variables as — nature of colleges (self-financing and government-aided), type of colleges (male and female) and area of colleges (urban and rural). According to these variables tabulization of scores has been done and Then statistical techniques have been applied accordingly.

Statistical techniques used:

For analysis of data the researcher calculated Mean, Standard Deviation, Standard error of Mean Difference and 't' value. AP these calculations have been made for small group also as the number of management samples is small. The researcher also calculated Mdn and percentage to know the number of teachers having high and low accountability.

To test the 't' value for large group .05 and .01 level of Significanehas been used which is 1.96 and 2.58 respectively. For significance of 'V value in small group samples — Table of 'V has been considered at different degrees of freedom.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data:

The first hypothesis was — "There is no significant difference between the accountability of management in self-financing and government-aided degree colleges".

TABLE 1
Comparison of Accountability of Management of Self-financing and Government-aided Degree Colleges

Calculated Values	ACCOUNTABILITY	
	Management of Self-financing Degree Colleges	Management of Government-aided Degree Colleges
Mean	92.73	120.15
SD	7.85	7.79
No. of Colleges	30	20
Mean Difference	27.42 (in favour of government-aided degree colleges)	
SE of Mean Difference	2.26	
CR or 't' Value	12.13	
df	48 **(23** + 19)	
Significant Value (at .01 level)	2.68	
Difference Significance	Significant	

From table 1, it is seen that Mean Value of Management accountability of Self-financing colleges is 92.73, which is 27.42 less than the Mean value 120.15 of Management Accountability of government-aided colleges. The standard Error of Mean difference is calculated as 2.26 and critical ratio or 't' is found as 12.13. This 'V value is significant at .01 level as it is very high than the required 't' value 2.68 at 48 degree of freedom. So, the null hypothesis is rejected that there is no difference between the accountability of management of self-financing degree colleges and government-aided degree colleges.

The second hypothesis was — "There is no significant difference between the accountability of teachers in self-financing and government-aided degree colleges".

TABLE 2
Comparison of Accountability of Teachers of Self-financing and Government-aided Degree Colleges

Calculated Values	ACCOUNTABILITY	
	Teachers of Self-financing Degree Colleges	Teachers of Government -aided Degree Colleges 141.85
Mean	139.30	
SD	8.01	11.80
No. of Teachers	200	200
Mean Difference	2.55 (in favour of government-aided .	
SE of Mean Difference	degree colleges)	
CR or 'Value	1.01	
Significant Value(at .05 level)	2.52	
Difference Significance	1.96	
	Significant	

From table 2, it is seen that Mean Value of Accountability of Teachers belonging to self-financing degree colleges is 139.30 and SD is 8.01. Similarly the mean and SD of accountability of teachers belonging to government-aided degree colleges is 141.85 and 11.80 respectively. The difference between two means is 2.55 which is in favour of teachers of government-aided degree colleges. On the basis of Standard Error of Mean Difference which is 1.01 the value of critical ratio has been calculated as 2.52. This value is significant at .05 level of significance as required value is 1.96 and this value 2.52 is quite more than that. So it can be concluded that teachers of government-aided degree colleges are more accountable than teachers of self-financing degree colleges. The second hypothesis has also been rejected.

Findings:

The following conclusion have emerged from the present study

1. Accountability of Management of degree colleges is related to the nature of the institute. There is a significant difference between the accountability of management of self finance degree colleges and government-aided degree colleges. Management of government-aided degree colleges are found to be more accountable than management of self-finance degree colleges.
2. There is a significant difference between the accountability of teachers of self finance degree colleges and government-aided degree colleges. Teachers of government-aided degree colleges are found to be more accountable than management of self-finance degree colleges.

Delimitations of the study:

1. The study in hand has been confined to study the degree colleges affiliated to C.C.S. University Meerut only. Hence, it does not include in its purview, the degree colleges affiliated to other universities.
2. The study in hand has been confined to study the self-financing and government-aided degree colleges only. Hence, it does not include in its purview, the government degree colleges.
3. The study in hand has been confined to study the degree colleges only. Hence, it does not include in its purview the junior high schools and inter-colleges.

Implications:

Any scientific theory should be based on empirical ground. Research related to higher education and accountability is a new phenomenon. The present study may be of immense use for the qualitative improvement in the field of higher education. Following are the implications of the study:

1. Accountability of any institution, which really counts in the success of any education system should be most important subject of educational research in present era.
2. The present study has brought to light certain valuable conclusions which would surely help in various facts of accountability. The study is found to be an additional significant contribution to the existing educational research.
3. The topic as well as the field covered will definitely have implications for further research as accountability is a very important issue to increase the quality of any institution.
4. The investigator developed her own tool for measuring management accountability. This tool will be of great practical utility in future to measure the accountability of any institution.
5. The present study is helpful in appointing teachers as per UGC norms and for admission of students as per university rules and regulations.

References:

1. Amidon, E. & Hunter, E. (1970), '*Improving Teaching'* New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
2. McNeil, John D. (1971), 'Towards Accountable Teachers: Their appraisal and Improvement' Holt Rinehart, Englewood Cliffs, New York.
3. Evelyn, K. (1970), *Biology Teachers Hand Book*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
4. Best, John W. (1977), '*Research in Education'* Indian reprint, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
5. Kulkarni, S.S. (1984), 'Introduction to Educational technology' Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi.
6. Koul, L. (2002). *Methodology of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
7. Saxena,N.R., Mishra, B.K., & Mohanty, R.K., '*Fundamentals of Educational Research'* R. Lall Book Depot, Meerut.