CHAPTER XI

THE FINDINGS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

We may now view our findings in the context of the broader and more basic objective that motivated this study viz., that of obtaining an idea of the quality of higher education, of understanding the character of the college and the University as ongoing concerns and of obtaining some guidelines to offer for educational policy and reform.

The teacher role as the focus of our observations has proved to be a valuable vantage point from which to observe the University, both as an agency for the socialization of the younger generation and as an institution for the advancement of knowledge. In the character of the interaction that teachers have with their students and in the quality of the instruction that they are able to impart we have clues to the functioning of the University as an agency for the socialization of the young. In the teachers' activities and outlook as scholars and as academics we have clues to the University as a community of scholars and an institution responsible for the advancement of knowledge.
THE UNIVERSITY AS AN AGENCY FOR THE
SOCIALIZATION OF THE YOUNG

The Findings and the Reforms Indicated

Our findings indicate that interaction between students and teachers, both in and outside the classroom is extremely limited. Within the classroom, the lecture is generally a monologue. Interaction in the form of questions and answers, or discussions is negligible. This is particularly true of the classroom situation at the First Year and the Intermediate level.

As regards teaching, guided by the criteria that we have used to distinguish between examination-oriented teaching and an advanced level of instruction we find that teaching at the undergraduate level is largely examination-oriented and that few teachers are able to obtain an advanced level of instruction. As many as 71 per cent of the teachers interviewed dictate notes regularly. The majority of the teachers are unable to lead their students on to analysis and criticism in the subject and confine themselves to explaining the texts and providing students with additional information. Few teachers recommend reference books at First Year and Inter. The majority say that reference books are recommended only to Junior/Senior B.A./B.Sc. students. Few teachers are able to initiate dialogue and discussion in the classroom. In fact a
substantial percentage of teachers go so far as to utilize even the tutorial session either to drill students for examinations by getting them to solve exercises or to answer questions from examination papers of the preceding years, or to complete portions of the syllabi that remain uncompleted due to shortage of teaching hours.

Our efforts to relate the findings about the role of teachers as pedagogues to the context in which the teachers function indicate that there are several features in the structure of the University and the college organization that inhibit interaction between teachers and students, curb the establishment of an advanced level of instruction and make for examination-oriented teaching. Prominent among these are the organization of instruction almost exclusively through lectures, large classes, the system of compulsory attendance, the pressure to complete the syllabus within a set time, and a system of evaluation which, while it puts a high premium on memorizing model answers to standard questions, does not effectively provide for rewarding the expansion of a student's learning or depth of his insight into a subject. Since teachers do not have any authority to obtain from their students an academic output of the kind that is required to advance the level of education there is little that they can do to improve the situation. The organization of education in a manner that reduces the Intermediate level to a qualifying base for specialization makes for a situation in which teaching is even more examination-oriented at the First Year/Inter level.
Equally important, as factors inhibiting interaction within the classroom are, the poor equipment of students in English, which is the medium through which instruction is imparted, and the absence of a practice of training students through school to articulate questions and viewpoints.

For reform in the direction of promoting interaction between teachers and students, and in the direction of advancing the level of instruction, the implications of these findings are quite clear. The revision and restructuring of the examination system, the organization of instruction through smaller classes, a more liberal provision of lecture-hours and periods for the completion of syllabi, abolition of the requirements of compulsory attendance, provision of greater authority and discretion for teachers in order to enable them to obtain the involvement of students, the provision of incentives to motivate teachers to reach out to an advanced level of instruction, and the remedying of the situation in which the First Year and the Intermediate year are reduced to a transitional stage are measures that are clearly indicated. An adequate equipment of students in the medium through which instruction is imparted at college or alternatively instruction through a language which is the same as the medium of instruction at school, and the cultivation at school of the ability to articulate questions and ideas are other
measures that are equally important to improving interaction and instruction at the college level are other measures indicated.

The equipment of students in the medium of instruction at college, and the cultivation of the ability to articulate questions and discuss ideas involve reforms in school system. As such, they lie outside the jurisdiction of University reform. All the other measures indicated lie within the sphere of University reform.

Obstacles to the Implementation of Reform

At a simplistic level, the reforms indicated may be viewed a mere matter of restructuring of practices and procedures within the University organization. But, in considering the feasibility of these measures we are forced to recognize several impediments to their implementation.

One of the basic obstacles to reform lies in the fact that examination system, large classes, and the requirement that teachers cover the syllabi within a limited time are mechanisms by which the University enables its affiliated colleges to stretch their resources to accommodate the expanding number of students who seek admission to higher education. Both, space in the form of lecture rooms and
laboratories, and teaching personnel can be utilized to their maximum by means of these mechanisms. Reforms in the direction of smaller classes and a more liberal provision of time to cover courses are not likely to be possible without serious curbs on the admission of students and a major increase in the per capita expenditure on higher education. The latter seems to be unlikely in view of the fact that colleges already function on deficit budgets and that any increase in fees is strongly discouraged. The former is not likely to be politically acceptable. The country is politically committed to the provision of equality of opportunity in education and measures that in any way restrict admissions to higher education are likely to be strongly resented and rejected on the basis of the argument that it is ultimately the economically and the socially deprived sections of society that are kept out when restrictions are enforced. Since the University is controlled by the State Legislature and since colleges are heavily financed by the State Education Department the political unacceptability to curbs in admission is of crucial significance to consideration of reform. Similarly increase in the expenditure of education is not likely to be possible if it involves an additional burden on the exchequers of the State or if it imposes any additional financial burden on the mass of the students seeking higher education.
Apart from this major obstacle to reform, we can visualize serious problems in the implementation of the measures suggested. Reform in the manner in which examinations are conducted the abolition of the practice of endorsing compulsion in attendance, the provision of greater authority and control to teachers, the situation of incentives to motivate teachers to reach out to a more advanced level of instruction, and the reorganization of instruction to facilitate the starting of specialization courses in the very first year of college would involve disturbance of age-old practices and firmly established mechanisms for obtaining the integration of the University and the college as ongoing system. It will be difficult to design measures, which, while they obtain new advantages in the direction of increasing teacher-student interaction and advancing the level of instruction help to retain the cohesiveness integration that is available in the present structure. Apart from the problem of conceiving and designing reforms in operational terms, there is the problem of implementation: The size of the University, is so large, and number of colleges, students and teachers involved are so many that change would be extremely unwieldy. If experiments misfire they could cause extensive damage. The fact that, in several colleges, the situation with regard to student discipline is rather uneasy makes experimentation even more precarious.
The designing of new mechanisms and their implementation will be difficult but not impossible. We have a far more crucial problem in the possibility that reforms in the direction indicated may not be accepted by teachers and students. Changes of the kind that have been indicated call for a much greater academic involvement on the part of students than that which obtains at present. Will students be willing to adapt themselves to the changes required? If not will they permit the introduction of reform? These are crucial questions. Students who are interested in the graduation certificate rather than in the content of the graduation course or in the process of learning are not likely to be receptive to reform. Structured as it is at present, the examination system allows students the possibility of equipping themselves for examinations with the minimum of academic involvement. With the help of commercial services like coaching classes and bazaar notes they are able to prepare themselves for University examinations and obtain the certificates they need. It is difficult to imagine that certificate-oriented students will easily give up the advantages of the existing situation. Since such students constitute a large section of those who are enrolled in Arts and Science degree courses we may anticipate considerable resentment and protest if reforms of the kind that we have indicated are introduced in the examination system.
The reforms may not be acceptable to teachers either. Interaction with students, both in and outside the classroom will call for a greater involvement on the part of teachers. Similarly, advancement in the level of instruction will mean more careful scholarship and preparation on the part of teachers. Unless teachers are dedicated scholars, and unless they themselves are enthused about the need to promote interaction and to advance the level of instruction they are not likely to put in the additional efforts required of them. Our findings indicate that the teachers are not particularly assiduous as scholars. What is probably even more significant from the point of their effectiveness in promoting standards in higher education is that they themselves do not seem to be particularly conscious of the obstacles to higher education and particularly enthused about the need for reform and change. Evidence for this is available in the fact that when asked to state their impressions regarding the obstacles they face as pedagogues and to suggest measures for improvement of standards in higher education teachers remained largely inarticulate.

A careful consideration of the measures suggested indicates that changes in the direction of increasing interaction between teachers and students and in the direction of advancing the level of instruction
calls for a basic change in the nature of the involvement of teachers and of students. In a situation in which teachers and students do not have the outlook and the attitude presupposed in the reforms suggested changes could have disastrous consequences.

We may take the proposed change in favour of voluntary attendance as an example. The concept of voluntary attendance is based on the assumption that students are interested in their subjects, genuinely involved in learning, and eager to reach out to the ideas and the information that a lecturer may put before them. As adults with academic interests, they are expected to be able to make a well-reasoned evaluation of the calibre of a lecturer and make an academically conditioned decision regarding utilization of their time. However, according to the teachers we interviewed barely 50 per cent of the students, at the colleges in which the study was conducted are to be genuinely interested in the subjects they study. If this is the situation at colleges at which the overwhelming majority of the students have first classes and distinctions at school leaving certificate examinations to their credit, the percentage of those who are interested is likely to be even poorer in the other colleges. Under the circumstances, the introduction of a system of voluntary attendance may make for a
situation in which students keep away from class in massive numbers. And, their decision to absent themselves may not be governed by academic considerations. It is one thing to introduce voluntary attendance as a corrective to weed the classroom of a few uninterested students. It is quite another matter to open the possibility of a situation in which practically 50 per cent of the students studying at colleges may opt out of lectures altogether and earn credit for college education without submitting themselves to the daily rigors of the college routine.

Separate Centres For The Academically-Oriented As a Solution

A confrontation with the fact that the nature of the student teacher interaction and the quality of the teaching observed are an almost inevitable consequence of the scale on which higher education has to be provided, and the recognition of the possibility that the majority of the students may not themselves be willing to change the existing situation enable us to see that the quality of the interaction and instruction that prevail may in fact be functional to the certificate-oriented demand for higher education. Under the circumstances we are forced to consider the possibility of separating students with purely certificate-oriented expectations from those with more academic inclinations and making separate provisions for the two kind of demands for education. The current demand for purely
Certificate-oriented education is the outcome of a complex interplay of social, political and economic factors. It may wear out when the factors generating it cease to be effective. However, as long as the demand lasts there is a danger of academic inclinations and purposes being swept away in the massive current of purely certificate-oriented demands.

In the situation at Elphinstone and St. Xavier's, we have ample evidence of the manner in which this can happen. Elphinstone college has a large proportion of students who are not highly certificate-oriented in their expectations. St. Xavier's college has a management that is explicitly committed to the "all round development of youth" and to the ideal of reaching out to an excellence that is something much more than obtaining good results at examinations. Both Elphinstone and St. Xavier's have Principals who believe that it is important to nurture this kind of excellence. Although it is not possible to measure the effectiveness of these factors separately, we have reason to believe that they definitely facilitate a somewhat more advanced level of instruction at these two colleges. But the influence exerted by these factors is not strong enough to halt the impact of certificate-oriented demands and of other structural features that inhibit an advanced level of instruction and make for
examination-oriented teaching. From the statements made by the Principals of these colleges it is clear that this is partly due to the fact that the colleges continue to have to cater to that section of the student population which is examination-oriented. But they point out if teaching continues to be examination-oriented it is more specifically because the college function within the framework of a University system which is geared to certificate-oriented, mass education.

The fact, of the presence, within the existing structure, of students who are not purely certificate-oriented in their demands, of managements, and Principals who value an advanced level of instruction and of teachers who are capable of teaching at an advanced level and of interacting fruitfully with students suggests that if such students, teachers, Principals and managements could somehow be brought to function together and allowed to keep themselves free of the constraints of the examination system, and of the other constraints to interaction and to an advanced level of instruction, it should be possible to develop a few pockets of an advanced level of undergraduate education and to protect these pockets from the onslaught of the currents of mass education. Critics of higher education in the country make repeated comments to
the effect that Universities are forced to be examination-oriented partly because of the pressure of numbers and partly because Indian society in general, and the occupation system in particular, place a high premium on the degree certificate. The general comment of the critics seems to be that although there may be pockets of public opinion and the employment market that value the content and the quality of learning rather than the certificate, such pockets are neither large, nor powerful enough to make an impact upon the system. The centres for undergraduate education at an advanced level could be conceived of as nuclei for future change.

How exactly such centres can be operated, what the financial implications of supporting them would be, what the possibilities for the employment of students who are the products of such centres are, whether the returns from an investment in an educational process that is likely to call for substantial involvement on the part of the students will at all be compensated by commensurate returns in terms of employment and status, whether students will be forthcoming in numbers that are substantial enough to sustain such centres, whether teachers with the
motivation and academic inclination necessary for the functioning of such centres will be available in adequate number, and whether the idea of sponsoring what may eventually develop into elitist centres for undergraduate education can at all be reconciled with the political ideal of quality of opportunity in higher education are serious questions that must be faced and answered before we moot the idea of creating separate pockets of this nature. The problems involved in fulfilling simultaneously purely certificate-oriented demands for higher education and demands that are more academic nature are extremely complex and it would be naive to suggest that they are easily surmountable. The fact that official Commissions, University bodies, academic seminars, and seasoned educationists have grappled, not too successfully, over the course of the last five or ten years, with the problems that we have identified, is a warning regarding the limitations to finding the right solutions.

Nevertheless, there is a point in emphasizing the development of undergraduate centres of academic excellence. Although the idea of sponsoring such centres is implicit in the Kothari's Commission's recommendation of autonomy for colleges that show evidence of high academic standards, we find that so far the various bodies that have deliberated on higher education have not recognized
adequately the importance of the development of separate centres of excellence for Arts and Science education at the under-graduate level. Although it is recognized that the provision of certificate-oriented courses for large numbers dilutes standards an explicit recognition of the possibility of improving standards by separating provision of the demand for certificate-oriented education may from the provision of the requirements of those who are more academically inclined is generally lacking. Somehow there seems to be a tendency to believe that the situation regarding standards in under-graduate Arts and Science colleges is irretrievable. In fact, one suspects an inclination to write off these colleges as a lost cause and to concentrate on conserving and nurturing standards at the post-graduate level. But since at least two out of the three colleges that we have observed in the course of our study indicate a positive potential for development in the direction of high academic standards, and we feel that our study offers a strong empirical base for the promotion of the idea of special centres to cultivate advanced standards in under-graduate education.

**Improvement of Standards for the Certificate-Oriented**

Although the development of centres for undergraduate instruction at an advanced level is important, there is a danger of by-passing the problem of standards as far as the larger population of students is concerned by concentrating exclusively on this aspect of reform. In
fact by recommending the isolation of those with academic inclinations into separate colleges we may inadvertently legitimize the reduction of the University to an agency which, for the major part provides education of a quality that is conditioned by commercial and politically demands. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that while the fulfilment of the less certificate-oriented demand for higher education is separately provided for, something must simultaneously be done to introduce into the certificate-oriented situation mechanisms that work in the direction of advancing academic standards. Although the improvement of standards for the large population of students enrolled in undergraduate Arts and Science colleges is fraught with problems, it should be possible to overcome some of the problems involved in providing instructions at an advanced level to large numbers by utilizing technological devices for communication with large groups. Moreover, our findings also suggest some possibilities of a breakthrough. Inter-college variations in student-teacher interaction, and in the character of instruction are valuable for the guidelines they offer in this connection.

At Ruia college where students and teachers are culturally more homogenous, and where by and large they
seem to be drawn from the same neighbourhood, interaction outside the classroom seems to be somewhat greater. At Elphinstone where classes are smaller and where tutorials are provided more liberally interaction within the classroom is distinctly more pronounced. At St. Xavier's where the management is explicitly committed to "excellence" we notice attempts at reaching to an advanced level of instruction, both through programmes instituted by the college and through the efforts of individual teachers. At St. Xavier's again we observe that several teachers are sensitive to limitations in terms of standards, and more enthusiastic about implementing reform. This in turn seems to be the effect of the discussions and seminars that are frequently held for the benefit of teachers. Together, the findings suggest each college indicates some features that could with advantage be developed at the college in which they occur and cultivate in the colleges in order to facilitate interaction and advance standards. However, our findings regarding the respective spheres of the influence of the college and the University suggest that operationally, efforts in this direction would be hemmed in by limitations that are inherent in the framework of the organizational relationship between the college and the University. For instance, colleges which are willing to provide tutorials
or lecture hours more liberally, may be encouraged to do so. But this involves additional expenditure and, in turn involves a marginal raise in the fees, which the University is not likely to allow. Or again, by instituting their own schemes of reward and control colleges motivate teachers to put in additional effort for the implementation of programmes aimed at promoting interaction with students, and at advancing the level of instruction. But, under the present circumstances colleges have very little scope to evolve their own mechanisms. These two examples help to illustrate the fact that the organizational relationship between the University and its affiliated colleges, is a positive obstacle to the development, on the part of colleges of administrative and organizational features that are conducive to the advancement of standards. They also help to bring out paradox that seems to lie at the root of some basic problems in the organization of higher education. This paradox is as follows.

We pointed out earlier that one of the major problems in instituting reforms in an affiliating University is the size of the University. The size of the University presents two kinds of obstacles to reform. Firstly, it is difficult to incorporate, into policy and reform conceived and designed at the level of the University, measures that
are specific enough to fulfill the needs of individual colleges. Secondly, it is difficult to implement policies centrally. The number of institutions covered by an affiliating University are too large and the geographical area too expansive to allow for an effective administrative or even supervision of details. Under the circumstances, it would seem to be ideal to allow individual colleges freedom to design and to implement relevant reforms. Yet the relationship between affiliated colleges and the affiliating University is such that colleges do not have the autonomy necessary to do so.

In principle colleges are independent organizations. Though they are subject to the governance of the University they are supposed to be free to define their own aims, objectives and organizational structures. The only requirement is that they conform to basic standards as defined by the University. However, in practice the University does not function as a purely standard setting body. It defines, in detail, the curricular, the syllabi, and number of lecture hours to be allocated to each subject. It conducts examinations, evaluates and certifies students. It closely defines the conditions for the promotion and the reward of teachers, and above all, it rigidly controls the finances of the college by means of strict regulations concerning fees and salaries. As a consequence colleges
have very limited control over the rewards and sanctions to be used to regulate the behaviour of students and of teachers. Understandably they are not able to function effectively as independent organizations.

At the same time because the colleges are not conceived of as partial structures of the University organization, the University does not taken upon itself the responsibility for the routine functioning of its affiliated colleges. In fact the links between the University and the college are hardly forged in a manner that makes for the functioning of the two as a single organization. Since the University is not responsible for the day to day running and administration of its affiliated colleges, it remains isolated and remote from the mainstream of college life. This means that the free flow and interaction that are essential to the functioning of the University and its affiliated colleges as a single system are totally absent. The situation that exists is hardly conducive to the spontaneous adaptation of goals, and to the emergence of mechanisms for adaptation to goal attainment, characteristic of an efficient system of organization. On the whole, our findings suggest that although the affiliating University may be highly efficient as a devise for the certificate-oriented education of a large number of students scattered over a wide geographical
territory, it is not particularly conducive to the cultivation of a high level of academic standards. The very mechanisms, by which it is able to obtain effectively, a certain basic quality and uniformity of standards, function as obstacles to the attainment of goals outside of those that are relevant to the examinations conducted by the University. The answer to the problems involved in promoting standards may, therefore, lie in granting substantial autonomy to colleges in order to enable them to evolve their own mechanisms for reform.

The question that is important to policy is the extent of the autonomy that will be required. If colleges define their own academic goals and devise their own procedures for the fulfilment of these goals, would it not be logical to expect them to have authority to grant their own degrees? In that event would the affiliating University be reduced to a body that recognizes and ratifies degrees granted by colleges? These are serious questions. They involve basic issues concerning the organization of higher education.

Actually, the measure of the autonomy that will be demanded by a college will depend on the extent to which a college wants to depart from courses, syllabi, teaching and evaluation methods as structured by the University. It will also depend on the extent to which colleges wish
to institute their own system of rewards and controls to exercise over teachers and students. As long as Indian society in general, and the occupation system in particular, continue to value the degree in the manner that they do at present the obligation to provide certificate-oriented higher education for a large body of students will continue. Since the existing system of affiliation, with a few modifications may, in the ultimate analysis be the only way to cope effectively with this demand, several colleges should be willing to continue to remain under the umbrella of the University as it presently functions. However, colleges that wish to reach out to more specifically defined goals and standards to function without being smothered by mass education, may seek autonomy to the point of total independence from the structure of the University organization. In our own sample, we can identify St. Xavier's as a college that may seek total independence. Ruia college on the other hand, is a college that may continue to find it useful to function within the framework of the University organization.

As regards the status of the affiliating University, since colleges are unlikely to be able to support post-graduate education severally, the University would probably continue, as it does at present, to be responsible for post-graduate instruction. Moreover, with the granting
of greater autonomy to colleges the University can probably concentrate on a more effective supervision towards the maintenance and the advancement of standards and take on greater responsibility for promoting co-operation and for co-ordinating the activities of the colleges in such a manner that the resources and the facilities available to each of the several colleges, affiliated to the University are optimally used by all.

A Free Play of Forces

We have suggested that interaction between teachers and students may be improved and that standards in higher education may be advanced by providing autonomy for colleges and by developing centres for undergraduate education at an advanced level. Both, autonomy for colleges and the separation of the certificate-oriented demand for higher education from the academically-oriented demand are measures that are likely to make for a considerable differentiation in institutions of higher education and generate a process of social "selection" of colleges. This would be conducive to making higher education more relevant but, it will generate some totally new phenomenon which, teachers no less than administrators and policy makers in higher education must equip themselves to face.
Will differentiation of the kind that we have visualized lead to a situation in which employment conditions in different colleges are so dissimilar that teachers may seek upward mobility by moving from one college to another? If so autonomy may make for an academic market situation which is totally different from the one that prevails today. What are the professional qualities that will then fetch better rewards in terms of employment? Will teachers who continue to be scholars be better rewarded than those who do not pursue scholarship? Will those who make efforts at reaching out to an advanced level of instruction be better rewarded than those who confine themselves to examination-oriented teaching? Or will it be vice versa? What
will the nature of the differential rewards be? All these are speculative questions. The answers will depend upon the shape that the organization of higher education takes and when if the present pattern is altered. These questions and several others that have not been articulated in these comments are indicative of the extent of the changes that a few crucial moves in altering the organizational structure of affiliating universities will make.

THE UNIVERSITY—AN AGENCY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND A COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS

Scholarship on the Part of Teachers

In viewing the inadequacies of teachers as scholars, we have, so far mainly been concerned with the implications that poor scholarship on the part of teachers has to their function as pedagogues. However, the findings regarding the outlook and the activities of teachers as scholars must also be viewed in the context of their implications for the University as a community of scholars, and as an agency for the advancement of knowledge. Of course, it is possible to absolve undergraduate teachers of responsibilities as scholars and as academics on the basis of the argument that the University fulfills its function as an agency for the advancement of knowledge, not through the academic activities of its undergraduate
teachers, but through the activities of its post-graduate departments and its research divisions. However, since more than 80% per cent of the teachers at the University in our sample are undergraduate teachers an argument of this nature cannot be justified. If such a large percentage of academics at the University are to be relieved of responsibilities for scholarship, the University can hardly be described as community of scholars. The finding that practically 50 per cent of teachers in three of the best Arts and Science colleges in the University are not particularly active as scholars, should, therefore, be looked upon as a matter of serious concern.

If there is any one single reason responsible for the poor level of the scholarly activity on the part of the teachers it is the fact that within the structure of the University organization teachers are not required to function as scholars. We have seen that teaching does not call for scholarship of a high order. In fact, the term "lecturer" which indicated the designation by which the overwhelming majority of the teachers belong indicates the status of the college teacher very succinctly. Teachers are mere functionaries who lectures on set topics, set terminal examination papers, mark attendance registers and perform other tasks related to the provision of instruction.

*This is a rough estimate. Exact figures are not available
Our observations further indicate that if teachers do not have the opportunity to function independently as scholars in their capacity as pedagogues, there does not seem to be much occasion for them to do so otherwise either. There are no faculty seminars at which teachers are required to read papers or present the findings from any studies that they have made to their colleagues. Teachers from different colleges rarely meet together to discuss new ideas, theories or teaching methods. Moreover, it is not customary for teachers to function as specialists and experts in the community. Colleges are rarely involved in research of problems that face the community, business or industry. On the whole, neither the position of the teacher at college and in the University nor the functions entrusted to teachers by the community are of a quality that reinforce the status of teachers as scholars and professionals. Under the circumstances scholarship and sensitivity to professional rights and obligations are either likely to die out of disuse or remain uncultivated throughout the teacher's career.

In order to restore the status of the teachers as scholars it is necessary to institute, for them, functions that call for scholarship. Moreover, it is necessary to structure the organization/system in such a manner that
scholarship is recognized and rewarded. All this involves radical changes. Meanwhile inter-college variations in the matter of the scholarship of teachers suggest some more specific measures.

Guided by the teachers' own statements we can infer that one of the major factors inhibiting scholarship on the part of teachers is the quality of the teaching required at the undergraduate level is not such as to require scholarship on the part of teachers. This implies that if scholarship is to be promoted it would be necessary to structure courses and to organize instruction in a manner that makes teaching academically more challenging, to undergraduate teachers. Inasmuch as teachers at colleges with post-graduate departments are more active as scholars, it would be beneficial to encourage post-graduate departments at undergraduate colleges, or to provide for the involvement of undergraduate teachers in teaching at the post-graduate level. Again, our findings suggest that the superior level of scholarship of the teachers at a college like St. Xavier's is, at least partly due to the fact that a small section of the population of teachers at this college have for their reference group as scholars, the international community of teachers teaching at other Jesuit colleges throughout the world. It should be possible to extend the reference group of
teachers at other colleges in like manner by sponsoring schemes for inter-University and international exchange of undergraduate teachers.

The Morale of the Teachers

Equally alarming, from the point of view of the functioning of the University as a community of scholars, are the findings concerning the teachers' image of their colleagues and of themselves in their professional status. As we have already noted, the poor professionalization of teachers is basically evident in the fact that they are insensitive to the obstacles in higher education and unable to make positive suggestions for reform. Further evidence of their poor professionalization and their low morale is available in the statements revealing their image of their colleagues and of their own social status. As many as 79% (40%) of the 171 teachers interviewed believe that less than 5 per cent of their colleagues continue to be scholars. Few teachers rate themselves alongside other professionals like doctors and engineers. As many as 32 per cent consider themselves to be on par with school teachers, clerks and third class government servants. Sixty-six per cent of the teachers believe that the status of the teaching profession has declined since the days in which they themselves were students. On the whole,
findings clearly indicate that the teachers' estimate of themselves and their colleagues is poor and that their morale as professionals is extremely low.

Inter-college comparisons indicate that there are several factors in the structure of the college organization that are likely to deflate the morale of the teachers as professionals and to make for a poor estimate, on the part of teachers of their own social status. Visible disparity between the standard of life of the teachers and their students, poor treatment of teachers by the college administration, lack of care in provision of facilities for their convenience and comfort, are factors that seem to be damaging to the morale of teachers. At the same time, inter-college comparisons also indicate that the morale of the teachers may be perked up by simple considerations shown by the management. To the extent therefore, it should be possible, even within the existing framework, to improve the morale of the teachers. However, the possibilities for such improvement are limited. The major obstacle to an improvement in the morale and the professional self-image of the teachers is the structure of the University organization. It does not provide for teachers to exercise any of the rights and responsibilities that we would normally expect of professionals.
Teachers do not share in discussions concerning the courses to be taught and the text-books to be used. They do not have the right to decide upon the time to be utilized to cover given syllabi. They neither exercise any rights in the matter of the admission of fresh students nor do they exercise decision in the matter of the final evaluation and certification of students who graduate.

While the low professional morale of teachers can largely be explained in terms of the fact that the professional identity of teachers is not encouraged in the existing structure we must also take some other factors into account in understanding the poor morale of teachers. In considering teachers' poor self-image as professionals it is important to note that college teaching is not well paid. Moreover it is an occupation which offers very little room for upward social mobility. Teachers function in a highly static employment market. Mobility is discouraged because there is no gain in moving from one college to another. Salaries are identical at all colleges. Meanwhile seniority in service which forms the basis of promotions is determined in terms of years of service at the college at which the
teacher is serving at the time of the promotion. While teachers may lose their seniority in moving from one college to another they may gain nothing in terms of an increment in their earning. As a result they are practically forced to continue serving in the college they initially join or in which they happen to have put in a few years of service. It is possible that this fact of poor possibilities for upward mobility creates among teachers, a poor image of their social status.

The situation would change, if possibilities for the horizontal and vertical mobility within the profession are opened up. Other factors that could help in improving the professional self-image and involvement of teachers are the development of professional organizations and the institution of mechanisms to encourage the independent functioning of teachers as professionals. The provision of facilities to do independent consultation for instance, or to function as experts on policy and decision making bodies could be of considerable help. Finally the importance of equating the salaries payable to teachers with the incomes that accrue from some of the other professions cannot be over-emphasized.

In conclusion, it is important to recognize that the major thrust of the reforms that we have suggested is in the direction of making teachers more involved as
scholars and more responsible as professionals. So far, measures for improvement in the work conditions of teachers have largely concentrated on matters such as their salaries, their work load etc. What is required is more schemes like the U.G.C. scheme offering research facilities to undergraduate teachers or the provision of Summer Institutes and workshops for teachers teaching at different Universities in this country / meet, discuss and learn about new teaching methods and techniques and about new developments in their fields.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

On the whole our observations and our findings indicate several limitations to the effective functioning of teachers, as pedagogues and as scholars.

In order to ensure that teachers are more effective as pedagogues it is necessary to promote interaction between teachers and students and to create conditions that are more favourable to an advanced level of instruction. Smaller classes, voluntary attendance, a more generous provision of time for the completion of courses, and a de-emphasis of examinations are some of the measures indicated. Our findings suggest that such change are likely to be difficult.
Moreover, reforms will not be really effective unless the fulfillment of certificate-oriented goals and demands for higher education is clearly separated from the fulfillment of more academic ideals.

Our observations suggest that the paucity of scholarly activity on the part of teachers may largely be explained by the fact that the functions required of teachers do not call for a high order of scholarship. Nor does the system provide any rewards for those who pursue scholarly activities on their own initiative. Finally we have said that the treatment generally accorded to teachers, both in the college and in the wider society is not such as to reinforce their self-image of their social status. All this is damaging to the professional commitment and morale of teacher.

We have suggested that it is important to institute rewards for scholarship on the part of teachers, and to institute new functions to ensure that teachers are active as scholars. We have tried to underline the point that both pedagogic standards and standards of scholarship in higher education depend on the morale of teacher and have indicated ways of improving their self-image.

Finally, we have advocated a less rigid structuring of the academic organization, and tried to emphasize the point that it is not particularly advisable to adopt an aggregative approach to University administration. Each
college has its specific strengths and weaknesses, and the structure of the University organization needs to be redefined to allow colleges freedom to develop their specific advantages, and to relate themselves to their particular problems.

What is the feasibility of the changes we have suggested? Is the economic and the political situation in the country conducive to the measures indicated? It would be outside the scope of this study to try to answer these questions.