THE ENDOGENOUS INDICATORS FOR PERFORMANCE OF
TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: AN EXPLORATORY
ANALYSIS AND THEIR RELEVANCE.

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

The demand for qualified and quality teachers has been continuously on the increase the world over. There has been an unprecedented expansion of school education especially in the developing countries, which has accentuated such a demand. In the past few years researchers have worked on factors that are instrumental in improving the efficiency of teacher education Institutions. Forecasting performance of the teacher education is a problem of obvious importance in education. Educationist, researchers and guidance workers always look for some endogenous indicators for predicting performance of Teachers Education Institute. Singh (1995) emphasized that the educationists in the country were greatly concerned and anguished with the continued deterioration in the quality of teacher education.

Garg (2000) studied growth and development of teacher education in the post independence period and he found that the teacher education after independence had expanded at a very faster rate but not focused on the quality aspect of teacher education programme.

Singh (2004) as regard teachings is concerned, some self-financed institutions provide theoretical knowledge but these are not enforced on practice teaching. A few of them totally ignore practice teaching and focused only admissions and fee. There were no qualified teachers, no proper infrastructure and essential requirements found in these institutions.
Narayan Rao and Brahadeeswaran (2004) in their study on assessing the quality and standard of higher education found that personnel management, financial management, classroom teaching, library facilities, interaction with external agencies, information network, decentralized responsibilities, programme for professional development and matching between Job and person were important indicators.

Singh (2005) found mushrooming growth in teacher education institutions all over the country. Since a Post Graduate with a B.Ed. degree was considered eligible to be a PRT, TGT, and a PGT as such there was an urgent need to consider this issue that is minimum eligibility to teach the elementary classes especially when there is a distinct teacher education program for preparing Elementary school/classes teachers.

Singh and Singh (2007) stated that quality control was a major problem in teacher education and neither the State Governments nor the Universities tried to enforce the minimum standards required for teacher preparation. As a result it was found that there were a large number of institutions which did not have the minimum necessary buildings, furniture, library, teaching staff with appropriate qualifications etc.

It is found from the literature that after providing the NCTE a statutory status, there has been a mushroom growth of privately managed self-financed secondary teacher education institutions in India. {Singh (2005) and Sidhu (2004)}. Most of the privately managed colleges in India did not follow the norms the standards prescribed by NCTE. {NCTE (1998)}. Quality had been deteriorating with the increase in quantity of institutions {Singh (2004)}. Most of the privately managed self-financed colleges were established with the motive of profit making. {Singh (2004) and Joshi (2005)}.
In relation to improvement in the performance of the teacher education institutions, the review of literature revealed that quality should be identified as a key indicator for the performance of any educational institution. Many researchers have postulated that variables such as periodic review of curriculum, continuing education, consultancy, staff development, research development, co-curricular activities, academic environment, student teacher interaction, decentralized administration, organizing seminar, conferences and workshops for teachers and staff influence the quality of education. Endogenous factors are truly internal aspect of the institutions and these factors may be enhanced within the institutions. A perusal of the related literature further reveals that only countable numbers of studies have been conducted in India related to the quality indicators for performance of Teacher education Institutions. It is also relevant for the quality concerns of teacher educations to know the present status of teacher education institutions regarding quality indicators. In the present study it is the first plan of its kind, designed to explore the endogenous indicators for performance of teacher education institute through factor analysis and SWOT analysis contribute to know the present conditions of Government and Self financed teacher education institutes in terms of strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats.

1.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY :

This study is conducted with basic following objectives as:

1. To explore the endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions through factor analysis.

2. To assess the perception of students towards determined endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions.

3. To assess the perception of staff towards determined endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions.
4. To assess the perception of administrators towards determined endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions.

5. To compare the perception of students, staff and administrators towards determined endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions.

6. To assess quality performance of Government Financed Teacher Education Institutions with reference to determined Endogenous Indicators.

7. To assess quality performance of Self Financed Teacher Education Institutions with reference to determined Endogenous Indicators.

8. To compare the quality performance of Government and Self Financed Teacher Education Institutions with reference to determined Endogenous Indicators in terms of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats.

1.2 HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY:

A null hypothesis was formed as “There exists no significant difference in perception of students, staff and administrators with reference to endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions”

1.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The aims of the present study to explore endogenous indicators for performance of teacher education institutions and to evaluate the quality status of the government and self financed teacher education institutions, therefore, the methodology were formed for phase-I and phase-II by the investigator which is given as below-
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PHASE-I: Development of Endogenous quality indicators through factor analysis.

Research method: In this phase-I, the investigation was followed descriptive survey method to explore endogenous quality indicators through perception of students, staff and administrators.

Sample design: In relation to development of endogenous indicators, it was needed that sample units should be aware and experienced about the quality aspects of teacher education institutions. Hence investigator was decided to select the Student who were appeared or qualified minimum master degree in education and above, Staff who had NET or Ph.D with minimum 2 year experience in teaching and Administrators who had qualified NET or Ph.D with minimum 2 year experience in administrative area. Hence 330 (200 students, 100 staff and 30 administrators) sample units were selected from Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra and eight teacher education institutions affiliated to Dr B. R. A. University, Agra through stratified random method whereas these institutions selected through purposive method of sampling because of exiting criteria of sample units.

Tools and techniques: In this phase investigator constructed a rating type scale to develop endogenous indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. In the preliminary phase of the scale investigator observed and piling a large numbers of items which expressed and ensured comprehensive coverage of the most relevant domains of the quality of the teacher education institutions. These items were collected by making extensive study of different literature sources such as the books, journals, dissertation abstracts, reference books, surveys of educational research, research studies of different researchers
and institutions, newspapers, magazines, publications of National Council of Teacher Education, MHRD, Govt. of India and related websites. There were 30 items enlisted in the first draft. The bunch of these items was given to 15 experts for getting their opinion and they were asked to sort out all the items into two categories such as (1) Related to the quality aspect of teacher education (√) and (2) Unrelated to quality aspect of teacher education (×) and also requested them to suggest such items (excepted listed items) that directly or indirectly influence the quality or performance of teacher education institutions. After that only those items were retained which have 75 percentage approvals of experts. Some more items suggested by experts were placed in this draft of the tool. Finally 40 items were retained in the second draft of this scale, A list of 40 items were administered on the 50 responders (10 administrators, 20 staff and 20 students) for refinement of the scale. Item – total item correlation and internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha reliability) protocol were followed for item analysis and refinement of the scale. Those items placed in the final form of the scale having more than 0.3 value of item-total item correlation. Finally a set of 35 items placed in the final form of the scale. The internal consistency and test retest reliability were estimated for the final form of the scale and index of Cronbach’s alpha reliability and test retest reliability were found satisfactory. The content and face validity were established for this scale (EIDS).

Phase- II : The Quality status of Government and Self Financed Teacher Education Institutions (SWOT Analysis).

Research method : In this phase- II, the aim of the study was to assess the quality status of government and self financed teacher education institutions through SWOT analysis on basis of quality status of institutions rated by their
Students, Staff, and Administrators. Thus descriptive survey method was employed to know the clear picture of these institutions with reference to determined quality indicators.

**Sample design:** Investigator selected 10 government and 10 self financed teacher education institutions from Dr. B.R.A. University, Agra through stratified random method. From each institution, 20 students, 5 staff, and 3 administrators were selected in sample units through stratified random method of sampling. Finally 560 responders included in sample units at this phase to evaluate the quality status of their institutions in relation to quality indicators.

**Tools and techniques:** It was essential to collect the information about the strategic planning with relevant information to make strategic decisions. Taking all these factors into consideration, investigator developed two scales such as quality assessment scale and questionnaire cum observation schedule for SWOT analysis of these institutions. The items for the assessment scale designed in a statements form based on quality items which already selected through refinement process in previous scale. Thirty five statements with representing quality items placed in the final form of this scale. The test retest reliability index was estimated for the final form of this scale and index test retest reliability was found satisfactory. The content and face validity were also established for this scale. Investigator also developed a questionnaire cum observation schedule for study such quality aspect which can be directly observed and recorded with reliable manner.

**1.4 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES:**

The data was analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics using SPSS 16.0 version. The questions and responses were coded and entered
in the computer using Microsoft Excel Software. Required analysis was done with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences 16.0 Version. The researcher has adopted various measures of statistics in order to arrange and thrash out the essence from the collected data and to make the data meaningful the following statistical techniques were used:

1. Mean
2. Standard Deviation
3. One way ANOVA
4. Post hoc test
5. Factor analysis
   i. Correlation matrix (Pearson moment)
   ii. KMO & Bartlett’s Test for sample adequacy
   iii. Index of communalities
   iv. Eigen values
   v. Scree plot
   vi. Factor loading
   vii. Rotated component matrix
6. SWOT analysis

1.5 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

The present study is done in two phases in which phase-I deals with development of the endogenous indicators through factors analysis and responders perception towards these indicators. The objectives-1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the present study are attained in the phase-I and phase-II deals with SWOT analysis of government and self financed teacher education institutions with reference to these indicators. The objectives 6, 7 and 8 are attained in the phase-II.
PHASE-I: Development of Endogenous Quality Indicators for Teacher Education Institutions (Factor Analysis).

Objective-1: To Explore The Endogenous Indicators for Performance of Teacher Education Institutions through Factor Analysis:

The investigator found in pre-requisite phase of factor analysis that the sample and data is appropriate and adequate (KMO and Bartlett’s test) and also the items have large proportion of its variance accounted by the factors which are suitable pre-requisites for factor analysis. All necessary steps are followed and finally summary of the finding (percentage of variance accounted by determined endogenous indicators and their items with factor loading) of this objective is shown in the table-1 as below.

Table 1: Percentage of variance accounted by determined endogenous indicators and their quality items with factor loading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Percentage of variance</th>
<th>Items with factor loading</th>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17.925</td>
<td>Mixed policy of centralized and decentralized management (.924), Recruitment and salary as per norms (.900), Accountability of staff (.814), Curriculum updated frequently (.828), Students involvement in the administration (.826), Transparent admission policy and fee structure (.812) Periodic investigation and supervision by administrative authority (.780), Academic calendar (.792), Comprehensive and continuous assessment (.738)</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student Support and Progression</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.636</td>
<td>Placement cell (.927), Student motivation for self learning (.901) Guidance and counseling facility (.939), Physical activity programme (.909), Attendance involvement in scholastic achievement (.902), High-tech teaching and learning environment (.841), Clear vision and mission in the mind of students (.705)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.390</td>
<td>Balanced work load among staff (.915), Staff student ratio (.909), Healthy staff student interaction (.924), Subject-wise teaching staff (.930), Internal coordination and management (.906)</td>
<td><strong>Team effort and Healthy Coordination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11.131</td>
<td>Guest lecture by educational expert (.858), Organizing seminar, conferences and workshops (.823), Remedial coaching (.617), Focus on teaching practice (.837), Enriching social, cultural and leisure activities (.732), Enforcement on research development (.810)</td>
<td><strong>Knowledge Assimilation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9.913</td>
<td>Highly motivated faculty with high job satisfaction (.924), Reward and recognition for outstanding progress (.889), Staff setting goal for teaching Development (.899), Well qualified and experienced teaching faculty (.907)</td>
<td><strong>Faculty quality and Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.133</td>
<td>Library with innovative resources (.855), Financial assets as per norms (.896), Electronic multimedia and laboratories (.843), Students support facilities e.g canteen, toilet, water etc. (.727)</td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure With Innovative Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is revealed from the table-1 that there are found six indicators which have labeled with their common features. These indicators are known as governance, student support and progression, team effort and healthy
coordination, knowledge assimilation, faculty quality and development and infrastructure with innovative resources and these indicators accounted nearly 75 percent of variance among observed quality aspects of the teacher education institutions. The index of factor loading is shown with quality items that indicate the level of importance of items in the endogenous indicators.

**Objective-2 : To assess the Perception of Students towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.**

In relation to perception of students towards these quality endogenous indicators, the key indicator ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ with 3.99 perceived by Students as most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The key indicator ‘Team Effort and Healthy Coordination’ with weighted mean 3.81 is perceived as second important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The indicator ‘infrastructure with innovative resources (3.80)’ considered as third important factor, Student Support and Progression (3.52) as fourth, Governance (3.41) as fifth and Faculty Quality and Development (2.93) perceived by the students as comparative less important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions.

**Objective-3 : To assess the Perception of Staff towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.**

In relation to perception of staff towards these quality endogenous indicators, the key indicator ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ with weighted mean 4.24 perceived by the staff as most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. Whereas the key indicator ‘Infrastructure with Innovative Resources’ with weighted 3.96 is perceived as second important indicator for
performance of teacher education institutions. The indicator ‘Team Effort and Healthy Coordination (3.74)’ considered as third important factor, Governance (3.69) as fourth, Student Support and Progression (3.62) as fifth and Faculty Quality and Development (3.49) perceived as comparative less important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions.

**Objective-4 : To assess the Perception of Administrators towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.**

In relation to perception of Administrators towards these quality endogenous indicators, the key indicator ‘Knowledge Assimilation’ with weighted mean 4.23 perceived by Administrators as most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. And the weighted mean for key indicator ‘Team effort and healthy coordination’ is found 4.20 and assigned second rank by the administrators. It means that administrators perceived the key indicator ‘Team effort and healthy coordination’ is second most important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions. The indicator ‘governance (4.09)’ considered as third important factor, Infrastructure with Innovative Resources (3.90) as fourth, Faculty Quality and Development (3.88) as fifth and student support and progression (3.42) perceived by the administrators as comparative less important indicator for performance of teacher education institutions.

**Objective-5 : To compare the Perception of Students, Staff and Administrators towards Determined Endogenous Indicators affecting the Quality of Teacher Education Institutions.**

F-value for perception difference among responders towards quality indicator ‘knowledge Assimilation’ is found 2.165 which is insignificant at 0.05
level of confidence. It means all responders assigned nearly equally weightage to the indicator ‘knowledge assimilation and F-values for key indicators “Infrastructure with Innovative Resource” and “Team effort and Healthy Coordination” are found 1.120 and 1.805 respectively which are also insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that there exists no significant difference found among the responders with reference to indicators Knowledge Assimilation, Infrastructure with Innovative Resource and Team effort and Healthy Coordination whereas in relation to quality indicators such as Governance, Student Support and Progression and Faculty Quality and Development F-values are found 3.479, 3.003 and 14.397 respectively which are significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of confidence, hence it can say that there is found some contradiction in the perception of the students, staff and administrators with reference to these key indicators. Thus related null hypotheses “There exists no significant difference in perception of students, staff and administrators with reference to endogenous indicators affecting the quality of teacher education institutions” is partially accepted in relation to quality indicators knowledge assimilation, Infrastructure with Innovative Resource and Team effort and Healthy Coordination and partially rejected in relation Governance, Student Support and Progression and Faculty Quality and Development.

PHASE-II: Quality Performance of Government and Self Financed Teacher Education Institutions (SWOT Analysis).

Objective-6: To Assess the Quality Performance of Government-Financed Teacher Education Institutions:

In relation to study the quality performance of government financed teacher education institutions regarding determined endogenous indicators;
investigator obtained weighted mean for each quality indicators and items under the determined endogenous indicators. The weighted mean for indicator ‘Knowledge assimilation’ was found 2.66 which considered as marginal strength of government financed teacher education institutions. In the same manner the weighted mean values for indicators ‘team effort and healthy coordination’, students support and progression and governance were obtained 2.68, 2.60, and 2.61 respectively which considered as marginal strengths whereas the weighted mean for indicator ‘faculty quality and development’ was found 3.05 which is considered as strong strength of the government financed institutions. With reference to key indicator ‘Infrastructure with innovative resources’, the weighted mean was obtained 2.40 which is considered as weakness of these institutions. These finding related to quality performance of government financed institutions has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table -2 as below-

**Table -2 : Quality performance of government financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
<th>Quality Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Assimilation</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective-7 : To Assess The Quality Performance Of Self-Financed Teacher Education Institutions:**

In relation to study the quality performance of self financed teacher education institutions regarding determined endogenous indicators. The weighted mean for key indicator ‘Knowledge assimilation’ was found 2.22 which considered as weakness of self financed teacher education institutions. In the same manner the weighted mean values for indicators ‘team effort and healthy coordination’, student’s support and progression governance and faculty quality and development were obtained 2.44, 2.32, 2.51 and 2.17 respectively which considered also as weaknesses of the self financed institutions whereas in relation to key indicator ‘Infrastructure with innovative resources’, the weighted mean was obtained 2.64 which is considered as marginal strength of the self financed teacher education institutions. These finding related to quality performance of self financed institutions has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table -3 as below-

**Table 3 : Quality performance of self financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
<th>Quality Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Assimilation</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>Marginal Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective-8: To compare the Quality Performance of Government and Self Financed Teacher Education Institutions regarding determined Endogenous Indicators in terms of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats:

In relation to compare the quality performance of government and self financed teacher education institutions regarding determined endogenous indicators in terms of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats with qualitative manner. The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the government and self financed teacher education institutions has been listed and given in summarized form as under–

STRENGTHS:

The strengths of the government and self financed teacher education with reference to endogenous indicators has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table 4 as below-

**Table 4: The strengths of government and self financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous indicators</th>
<th>Government financed Institutions</th>
<th>Self financed Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge assimilation</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\phantom{1}})</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\phantom{1}})</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\phantom{1}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\phantom{1}})</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\phantom{1}})</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\phantom{1}}) (\sqrt{\phantom{1}})</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\sqrt{\phantom{1}}\) Indicated the strength and * indicates marginal and **indicates the good strength.
In relation to key indicators knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance, student support and progression and faculty quality and development, the government financed teacher education institution found in better condition than self financed institutions and these key indicators are considered as strengths of the government financed institutions. There are the some qualities aspects considered as strengths and pointed out by the investigator during the investigation and analyzed the fruitful data. The effective and frequently organization of guest lectures by experts, research development, focus on teaching practice, cultural activities, balance work load among staff, healthy staff-students interaction, effective internal coordination and management, students motivational mechanism, centric policy of centralized and decentralized management, recruitment and salary as per norms, accountability of staff, periodic investigation by higher authority and highly motivated and experienced faculty pointed out as strengths of the government financed teacher education institutions. Whereas accountability of the staff, effective internal coordination and management, organization of cultural activities and infrastructure, mechanism for students motivation and mixed policy of management were pointed out and considered as strengths of the self financed teacher education institutions.

WEAKNESSES:

The weaknesses of the government and self financed teacher education with reference to endogenous indicators has been summarized in qualitative manner in the table 5–
Table 5: The weaknesses of government and self financed institutions with reference to endogenous indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous Indicators</th>
<th>Government financed Institutions</th>
<th>Self financed Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge assimilation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effort and Healthy Coordination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure with Innovative Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support and Progression</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality and Development</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Indicates the weaknesses

In relation to key indicator ‘infrastructure with innovative resources’, the government financed teacher education institution found in poor condition than self financed institutions. Further there are several weaknesses of the government institutions and pointed out by the investigator. Remedial classes for weaker students, poor staff-student ratio, lack of subject wise teaching faculty, infrastructure, lack of placement facilities, poor attendance of the students in the class and lack of comprehensive assessment considered and pointed out as weakness of the government teacher education institutions.

Further, In relation to key indicators knowledge assimilation, student support and progression, team effort and healthy coordination, governance and faculty quality and development, the self financed teacher education institution
found in poor condition than government financed institutions and these key indicators are considered as weaknesses of the self financed institutions. The key aspects such as the organization of guest lectures by experts, research development, focus on teaching practice, balance work load among staff, recruitment and salary as per norms, remedial classes for weaker students, poor staff-student ratio, lack of placement facilities, lack of subject wise teaching faculty, poor attendance of the students in the class, biased fee structure, lack of comprehensive assessment and lack of highly motivated and experienced faculty pointed out and considered as weaknesses of the self financed teacher education institutions.

**OPPORTUNITIES:**

The government financed teacher education institutions have opportunities to develop the quality performance with standard parameters having their strengths with reference to key indicators knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance, student support and progression and faculty quality and development and these institutions may develop the action plan for faculty development and set the goal of achievement for next coming years. The qualified and experienced faculty can be effectively moulded the pedagogical aspect of the teaching and may educate the students with future vision whereas the self financed teacher education institutions have poor quality aspects relation to these strength quality indicators but infrastructure in these institutions are found well maintained and updated with standards. These institutions should be focused to develop the quality indicators such as knowledge assimilation, good governance and management, students support and progression and faculty quality and its development. The strength of infrastructure in these institutions may play important role for effective and efficient conduct of the educational programmes.
THREATS:

In the government institutions, the insufficient and poor infrastructure facilities may be the major threats before these institutions. Lack of remedial classes for weaker students, poor staff-student ratio, lack of subject wise teaching faculty, infrastructure, lack of placement facilities, poor attendance of the students in the class and lack of comprehensive assessment in these institutions may create obstacles in getting achievement of the students and performance of these institutions. Teacher education institution is a place where teachers are moulded for the nation but with lack of these quality aspects, it is not possible to get these objectives of the teacher education by these institutions, whereas compare to government institutions, self financed institutions are running with lack of quality indicators such as knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance and students support and progression. Most of the self financed institutions are opened mostly with commercial motives. It is the major threats not only before these institutions but also for students and nation. The teacher with efficiency cannot be produced by such institutions those have only commercial motives.

1.6 CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY:

It is conclude that the determined six endogenous indicators accounted 75.128 percentage of total variance among the observe quality aspects of teacher education institutions and high value of communality for each item is indicated that observed quality items play important role for overall development of teacher education institutions. The endogenous indicators such as knowledge assimilation, governance and student support and progression accounted more observed quality items. It means these aspects of teacher education are most important determinant for performance of teacher education institutions.
Further it is concluded that all responders (students, staff and administration) have assigned as prior and same rank to the endogenous indication ‘knowledge assimilation’, it may be cause that the key indicator ‘Knowledge assimilation’ encapsulated the quality aspects such as guest lecture by experts, teaching practice, research development and cultural activities which are essential for faculty achievement and also considered as valuable and important key aspects by higher inspection authority whereas it was found major differences in perception of responders in relation to governance, team effort and healthy coordination and faculty quality and development. The students have assigned low rank to these indicators as compared to staff and administrators it may be due to different level of maturity and experience.

The key indicator infrastructure with innovative resources perceived by the students as third important quality aspect of the teacher education institutions, whereas staff perceived it as second and administrators perceived as fourth important quality aspects for performance of the institutions. The staff perceived the infrastructure facilities as comparative more important for the quality performance; it may be because that without sufficient availability of infrastructure, educational activities cannot be performed in the institutions.

The endogenous indicator ‘team effort and healthy coordination’ is perceived by students and administrators as the second most important quality aspect of the teacher education institutions. The reason may be behind it that indicator ‘team effort and healthy coordination’ encapsulated the key aspects such as balanced work load among staff, staff-students ratio, healthy staff-students interaction, subject-wise teaching staff and internal coordination and management, therefore it can say that any institution cannot be performed with efficiency in lack of manpower and also human resources with coordination is backbone of the institutions.
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In relation to quality performance of government and self financed teacher education institutions, the quality indicators knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, students support and progression, governance and faculty quality and development considered as marginal strengths of the government financed institutions whereas these indicators are found as weaknesses of the self financed teacher education institutions. It may be because that the self financed institutions are opened mostly with commercial motives and parochial feelings with inadequate physical facilities, insufficient teachers, unskilled trainees, poor practice teaching and high tuition fee paid by students. The infrastructure found satisfactory in the self financed teacher education institutions as compare to government institutions. It may be due to the infrastructure in the self financed institutions are the private property of the management and also well maintained due to the frequently inspections by the administrative authority. It reflects their strengths and has opportunities with availability of adequate infrastructure because infrastructure availabilities are key essential for effective and efficient functioning of the educational programmes. The government financed teacher education institutions have opportunities to develop the quality performance with standard parameters having their strengths these institutions may develop the action plan for faculty development and set the goal of achievement for next coming years whereas as compare to government institutions, self financed institutions are running with lack of quality indicators such as knowledge assimilation, team effort and healthy coordination, governance and students support and progression. Teacher education institution is a place where teachers are moulded for the nation but with lack of these quality aspects, it is not possible to get the objectives of the teacher education by these institutions and it can treat as major threats of these institutions.
1.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The study is delimited in the following manner-

1. The present study is delimited with number of observed quality items. There are encapsulated 35 items to explore endogenous indicators for performance of teacher education institutions.

2. The present study is delimited with number of teacher education institutions (sample units). Only ten teacher education institutions are selected in the phase-I (factor analysis) which consisted with a central university, a deemed university and eight institutions have been taken from the Dr. B.R.A. University, Agra and In the phase-II (SWOT analysis) only 20 teacher education institutions (10 government and 10 self financed teacher education institutions) were selected from the Dr. B.R.A. University, Agra for the study.

3. The present study is delimited with the number of the responders (sample units). In the phase-I, only 330 sample units selected for the development of quality indicators whereas in the phase-II, only 560 sample units selected from the 20 teacher education institutions for the SWOT analysis of the government and self financed teacher education institutions.

4. The present study is delimited with its scope. The results can be generalized on only the teacher education institutions.

5. The present study is delimited with the nature of quality items. All these quality items are belongs to endogenous (internal) aspects of the teacher education institutions.

6. The present study is delimited with nature of the study. The present study is exploratory in nature and carried with the exploratory factor analysis and SWOT analysis.
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