 ROLE SOCIALIZATION AND VIEWS OF TEACHERS TOWARDS THE PROFESSION

In order to orient themselves into teaching role, teachers have to go through a process of socialization. Socialization refers to learning of social roles. It has been defined as a process by which persons selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills and knowledge, in short, the cultural content of the groups to which they belong or may become members of (Merton, 1957). However, professional socialization is seen as the process of shaping the individual to fulfill the needs of the profession as well as that of the society. In analyzing it, one has to consider reciprocity between an individual’s aspirations and occupational and institutional structures (Goode, 1960). Further, in order to socialize oneself into an occupation, the primary group assumes significance. It is suggested that the conception of oneself is the reflection of one’s behaviour in response to that of one’s primary group (Cooley, 1956).

Parsons (1975) is of the opinion that the difference between the professional and the business role is only that of profit motive. This difference is mainly influenced by the core values prevailing in the two settings, that is, the profession and the business. In this connection he provides a theoretically more consistent distinction between the particularistic and the universalistic societies. According to him, rationality, functional specificity and universalism are the salient features of the professional as well that of the business role. These are derived mainly from the fundamental character of modern or universalistic against traditional or particularistic societies, emphasizing on particularism and functional diffuseness. These affect the roles of the individuals in the two different settings. In this theoretical schema, Parsons also includes
acquiring scientific and systematic body of knowledge as a part of the professional socialization.

Professional role socialization is largely experienced within an institutional setting, be it a university, college or a specialized academy. In the recent past, especially during the twentieth century, the spread of liberal education and the progression of university system has opened many opportunities for persons to enter into professions such as Law, Medicine, Engineering etc. and gain academic legitimation. In this regard, Parsons (1968) contends that universities have opened faculties to impart training in these areas and to systematize cognitive basis of professional socialization. However, teaching as a profession is not attractive to many as it cannot provide an elite status to them. It is observed that with the spread of education, it has lost its esoteric knowledge base. Further, with the growth of diversified occupational structure in specialized fields, teachers have also lost their relative income levels. It is suggested that the outstanding characteristics of teachers as an occupational group are, its large size, its high proportion of female members, its low social class composition, its small measure of autonomy as a group and its segmentation (Leggatt, 1970).

In the context of the present study, an attempt has been made to analyse certain aspects of role socialization of teachers and their views towards the profession.

1. PROFESSIONAL ROLE SOCIALIZATION OF TEACHERS

It is often observed that people are not very keen to join the teaching profession. Given an opportunity they would prefer to join some other occupation. However, quite a few of them may be inspired to join it because they have some family members in it while others may do so because they enjoy working in this profession. Besides, there may be different set of factors which may motivate individuals to join it. Some of
them may also express regret for having joined this profession and show reservations about its role in fulfilling their expectations. Quite a few of them, may feel that their services have not been recognized in the society while others may contend that they as teachers, can play an important role in the society. Further, some teachers may feel that their status can be raised in the society through adopting certain ways and means. The above aspects have been analysed to understand the views of teachers as a part of professional role socialization.

(1) FAMILY MEMBERS IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Family as a primary group assumes significant importance in influencing the behaviour of its members. An attempt was made to find out whether the teachers had any members of the family in the profession.

A cursory look at Table 3.1, shows that among the 132 university teachers, (13.2) half of them had family members in the teaching profession. A slightly larger proportion of female (52.94%) than male (48.15%) teachers were having family members in it. In the case of college teachers, out of 45, only 20 teachers (44.45%) were having family members in this profession. A higher proportion of teachers in the university than in the colleges having family members in this profession, may be due to a more conducive environment prevailing at home, necessary for pursuing an academic career. In between the Government and the Private college, more number of teachers in the Private (12) than in the Government college (8) had family members in the teaching jobs. However, the sex-wise distribution shows that more male (6) than female (2) teachers in the Government college and more female (8) than male (4) teachers in the Private college had family members in it. The above analysis suggests that a fairly good proportion of teachers might have been inspired to join this profession because of the influence of their family members.
Table 3.1
Members of the Family of Teachers in this profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>University teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54.55)</td>
<td>(50.00)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45.45)</td>
<td>(45.45)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.00)</td>
<td>(47.06)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.00)</td>
<td>(50.00)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures within brackets represent percentages
KIN RELATIONS OF TEACHERS IN THIS PROFESSION

Those teachers who expressed that they had some members of their family in this profession, were further asked to specify their relationship with them.

As revealed by Table 3.2, among the university teachers, a large proportion of them (43.93%) referred to wife/husband working in the teaching job. This was followed by sister/brother relationships in it (37.87%). A higher proportion of male (51.28%) than female (33.33%) teachers mentioned that they had wife/husband in this profession. However, in the case of sister/brother category, there is a higher proportion of female than male teachers. The other close relations mentioned in this profession were father (10), in Laws (8), aunt/uncle (6), daughter/son (4) and mother (2). However, there was not any marked difference in terms of responses of teachers on the sex-basis.

On the other hand, in the colleges, again, out of 20 teachers who mentioned that they had some relation in this profession, as many as 12 had indicated that they had wife/husband in it. There appears no difference in this category in between the two colleges. However, more male than female teachers in the Government college have referred to it whereas in the case of Private college, there is an equal proportion of male and female teachers, having stated as such. Further, three teachers each, have mentioned sister/brother and in-laws respectively in this profession while two have mentioned mother, in it. Again, one each has mentioned either father/daughter/son in this profession, whereas none has mentioned about uncle/aunt category. Interestingly, in the case of Private college, all the 3 female teachers had mentioned about their in-laws being in the teaching jobs. This may be because their in-laws may have preferred to have a daughter-in-law in the same profession.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Kin Relations</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male N=39 Female N=27 Total N=66*</td>
<td>Male N=6 Female N=2 Total N=8*</td>
<td>Male N=4 Female N=8 Total N=12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wife/husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (51.28) 9 (33.33) 29 (43.93)</td>
<td>5 (83.33) 1 (50.0) 6 (75.0)</td>
<td>3 (75.00) 3 (37.50) 6 (50.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sister/Brother</td>
<td>12 (30.76) 13 (48.14) 25 (37.87)</td>
<td>1 (16.64) 0 (0.00) 1 (12.50)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 2 (25.00) 2 (16.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5 (12.82) 5 (18.51) 10 (15.15)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 1 (12.50) 1 (8.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In-laws</td>
<td>3 (7.69) 5 (18.51) 8 (12.15)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 3 (37.50) 3 (25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Uncle/Aunt</td>
<td>4 (10.25) 2 (7.40) 6 (9.09)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Daughter/Son</td>
<td>4 (10.25) 0 (0.00) 4 (6.06)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 0 (0.00) 0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (25.00) 0 (0.00) 1 (8.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1 (2.56) 1 (3.70) 2 (3.03)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 1 (50.00) 1 (12.50)</td>
<td>0 (0.00) 1 (12.50) 1 (8.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Figures within brackets represent percentages
2. *Multiple Responses
(3) TEACHERS INTERESTED IN TAKING UP OTHER OCCUPATIONS INITIALLY

The teachers were asked to specify whether they were interested in taking up other occupations initially. As revealed by Table 3.3, out of 132 teachers in the university sample only 34 (25.75%) were interested in following other occupations initially while 98 (74.25%) were not interested in other occupations. There does not appear any marked difference between the male (27.16%) and female (23.50%) teachers in terms of responding positively to this question. However, in the case of colleges, out of 45 teachers, 17 (37.78%) responded that they were interested in taking up other occupations initially. A higher proportion of teachers in the university than in the colleges not interested initially in following occupations other than teaching, may be due to their greater interest and motivation to go in for this profession. In between the Government and the Private college, there was not any difference observed as only 8 teachers in the Government and 9 teachers in the Private college, gave a positive response to this question. But more male (6) than female (2) teachers in the Government college and more female (6) than male (3) teachers in the Private college mentioned about their taking up other occupations initially.

The above analysis indicates that, by and large, teachers were not interested in taking up other occupations initially. This may show that most of them were already fairly pre-disposed towards taking up the teaching profession.

Those respondents who replied that they were initially interested to take up other occupations than teaching, were further asked to specify the type of occupations they were interested in.

As revealed by Table 3.4, out of 34 university teachers, 7 each stated that they would have preferred to join professional jobs (law, medicine, engineering, MBA etc), pharmaceutical/drug industries and research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interested in other occupations initially</td>
<td>22 (27.16)</td>
<td>12 (23.53)</td>
<td>34 (25.75)</td>
<td>6 (60.00)</td>
<td>2 (15.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Not Interested in other occupations initially</td>
<td>59 (72.84)</td>
<td>39 (76.47)</td>
<td>98 (74.25)</td>
<td>4 (40.00)</td>
<td>11 (84.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>81 (100.00)</td>
<td>51 (100.00)</td>
<td>132 (100.00)</td>
<td>10 (100.00)</td>
<td>13 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.3**

Teachers interested in taking up occupations other than teaching initially

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interested in other occupations initially</td>
<td>22 (27.16)</td>
<td>12 (23.53)</td>
<td>34 (25.75)</td>
<td>6 (60.00)</td>
<td>2 (15.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not Interested in other occupations initially</td>
<td>59 (72.84)</td>
<td>39 (76.47)</td>
<td>98 (74.25)</td>
<td>4 (40.00)</td>
<td>11 (84.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81 (100.00)</td>
<td>51 (100.00)</td>
<td>132 (100.00)</td>
<td>10 (100.00)</td>
<td>13 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Figures within brackets represent percentages
and research institutes respectively. Another 6 of them mentioned that they would have liked to join civil services while 5 would have opted for defense services (all males). One each would have preferred to take up judicial service and a job in the private sector respectively. A higher proportion of female than male teachers appear to have opted for the professional jobs mentioned above.

On the other hand, in the case of colleges, out of 17 persons who responded positively to their taking up occupations other than teaching initially, as many as 7 of them would have opted for civil services. Another 4 each would have preferred to join professional jobs and defense services respectively, while 2 of them would have opted to join judicial services. There appears not much difference in between the two college so far as responses to various categories of jobs are concerned except that more female than male teachers in the Government college and all female teachers in the Private college would have preferred to join civil services.

3(a) REASONS GIVEN BY TEACHERS FOR NOT HAVING JOINED THESE OCCUPATIONS

A variety of reasons were provided by the respondents to explain why they had not joined the profession of their choice. The reasons given by teachers have been classified sex-wise, separately for the university and college teachers. These are multiple responses and the figure within a bracket represents number of respondents. In view of small number of responses, these have been clubbed together for teachers belonging to different courses in the university and teachers in both the colleges.

1) REASONS GIVEN BY UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

a) MALES

I) Could not clear defence entrance examination/resistance shown by mother to join the armed forces/could not join army due to health reasons (5).
Table 3.4
Occupations other than teaching in which Teachers were interested initially

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Professional jobs (Law, Medicine, Engineering, M.B.A.)</td>
<td>3  (13.64)</td>
<td>4  (33.33)</td>
<td>7  (20.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical / Drug Industries</td>
<td>4  (18.18)</td>
<td>3  (25.00)</td>
<td>7  (20.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Research Institutes Scientists</td>
<td>4  (18.18)</td>
<td>3  (25.00)</td>
<td>7  (20.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>IAS/Allied Services (Civil services)</td>
<td>4  (18.18)</td>
<td>2  (16.67)</td>
<td>6  (17.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Defence Services</td>
<td>5  (22.72)</td>
<td>0  (0.00)</td>
<td>5  (14.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Judicial Services</td>
<td>1  (4.55)</td>
<td>0  (0.00)</td>
<td>1  (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Private sector (Banking and Financial organizations)</td>
<td>1  (4.55)</td>
<td>0  (0.00)</td>
<td>1  (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22  (100.00)</td>
<td>12  (100.00)</td>
<td>34  (100.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures within brackets represent percentages
II) Non-availability of opportunity and personal circumstances such as mother’s ill-health not permitting to move out of Chandigarh (4).
III) Due to poor family background and financial constraints, could not join professional courses like medicine/engineering/agriculture (3).
IV) Got teaching job immediately after post-graduation/Ph.D, so could not appear for I.A.S/Judicial service (3).
V) Could not qualify the civil services examination (2).
VI) Not many research institute in life-sciences available in the country (2).

b) FEMALES
I) Could not join medical college because of non-admission/not able to do dissections/fell seriously ill and parents did not allow to join medical profession (4).
II) Could not get selected as a research scientist in an institute/never got an opportunity to join a research institute (2).
III) Could not appear for I.A.S as parents convinced that teaching was best suited for girls and one could encounter difficulties in family adjustments after joining the above service (2).
IV) Got married locally, as such could not join the industry. Besides, there is a hectic schedule in industries and there are no big industries around (2).
V) Was not aware of advertising schools, as such took up science stream (1).

2) REASONS GIVEN BY COLLEGE TEACHERS
a) MALES
I) Could not join defense services on medical grounds/was not in a position to qualify the interview for getting into army (4).
II) Could not clear the competitive examination for civil/judicial services (3).
Table 3.5

Whether Teachers enjoy working In the Teaching Profession or not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Enjoy working</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(97.43)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(98.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Don't enjoy working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.57)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures within brackets represent percentages
III) Wanted to stay with parents despite clearing and getting a class-II post in civil services (1).

IV) Did not get a good job in the private sector (1)

b) FEMALES

I) Could not clear the competitive examinations for civil services (3).

II) Chartered Accountancy was a time-consuming profession, so preferred to join teaching (1).

III) Father interested in teaching profession rather than encouraging to join I.P.S. (Indian Police Service) (1).

The above analysis brings out that most of the teachers both in the university and colleges, have failed to take up the desired occupations mainly because of their personal and familial circumstances. In the case of female teachers, they were mainly guided by their parents to take up teaching jobs as their argument was that this would also help them to perform their family roles adequately.

(4) ENJOY WORKING IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION OR NOT

In order to be productive in one’s profession, one needs to enjoy working in it. This is also indicative of one’s involvement in and satisfaction with the profession. The respondents were asked whether they enjoyed working in the teaching profession or not. The examination of Table 3.5, shows that all teachers in the university and colleges except one male in the science stream in the university, have stated that they enjoy working in this profession. This shows that they are fairly well pre-disposed and motivated to take it up. However, they may have different motives to pursue their interest in this profession.

(5) FACTORS MOTIVATING TEACHERS TO JOIN THIS PROFESSION

Motivations are certain kinds of drives that influence the behaviour patterns of people. An attempt has been made to analyse the factors
### Table 3.6
Factors motivating Teachers to join this Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Motivating factors</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mean Score Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Inspired by teachers in contact during educational career</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Desire to serve humanity</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Plain liking for the job</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fascination for professional status</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Desire for recognition in the society</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Better prospects to go abroad</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>No other option in terms of a career</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |                                                           |                          |      | Social Science (Mean Score Value)              |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | Male | Female | Combined Mean |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 3.03  | 4.08   | 3.64         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 3.83  | 2.73   | 3.33         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 4.03  | 2.84   | 3.49         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 3.87  | 4.12   | 3.98         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 4.77  | 4.92   | 4.83         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 6.22  | 6.80   | 6.48         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 7.80  | 7.40   | 7.62         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 6.09  | 7.71   | 6.72         |

|       |                                                           |                          |      | Professional (Mean Score Value)               |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | Male | Female | Combined Mean |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 3.18  | 3.28   | 3.22         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 3.72  | 3.85   | 3.38         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 3.18  | 3.71   | 3.38         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 4.72  | 3.57   | 4.27         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 4.36  | 3.70   | 4.05         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 4.27  | 4.28   | 4.27         |
|       |                                                           |                          |      | 6.45  | 7.00   | 6.66         |

Table Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Motivating factors</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government (Mean Score Value)</td>
<td>Private (Mean Score Value)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Combined Mean</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Desire to serve humanity</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Inspired by teachers in contact during educational career</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fascination for professional status</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Desire for recognition in the society</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chance for self-expression</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Plain liking for the job</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Better prospects to go abroad</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>No other option in terms of a career</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
motivating teachers to join this profession. A set of eight factors was provided to the respondents and they were asked to rank these in order of their preferences. A factor ranked first, was given a score of one while that ranked second was assigned a score of two. In the same way, the other factors were ranked and the scores were assigned according to their ranking positions till the last factor, which was assigned a score of eight. A mean score value was worked out for each of these factors separately sex wise as well as in the combined form for all the university and college teachers. Further, an overall mean score value for these factors was also worked out separately for university and college teachers to analyse the relative preferences of factors motivating them to join this profession. The lower the mean score value, the higher was the rank assigned to that factor by the teachers.

An examination of Table 3.6, reveals that in the overall analysis, the teachers in the university have ranked “inspired by teachers in contact during educational career” as a factor motivating them on the top (2.98). This is followed by “desire to serve humanity” (3.54) and “chance for self-expression” (3.56) in that order. In the Parsonian framework, these three top ranking factors reflect rationalistic and universalistic orientation of teachers. The ‘inspiration got from teachers’ show role-commitment and dedication as well as ‘chance for self-expression’ as a part of personality development, also indicates a rationalistic orientation whereas ‘desire to serve humanity’ reflects a universalistic outlook of teachers. ‘Plain liking for the job’ has been assigned the fourth rank. This shows an affective orientation of teachers. This is followed by ‘fascination for professional status in the society’ and ‘desire for recognition in the society’ as fifth and sixth factors motivating them to join this profession. To a certain extent, these are indicative of achievement and individualistic orientations. The next factor ranked in order is, ‘better prospects to go abroad’. However ‘no
other option in terms of a career'\(7.20\) is the lowest ranked factor motivating teachers to join this profession.

In between teachers belonging to different streams of courses in the university, it is observed that science teachers have placed the factor of ‘fascination for professional status in the society’ higher than ‘plain liking for the job’. However, in between male and female teachers in this group, male teachers, have assigned first rank to the factor ‘desire to serve humanity’\(3.02\). Again ‘plain liking for the job’\(3.86\) has been ranked higher than the ‘chance for self expression’\(4.07\). On the other hand, the female teachers have placed ‘fascination for professional status in the society’ and ‘desire for recognition in the society’ as factors above the ‘desire to serve humanity’. They seem to be more achievement and individualistic oriented.

Among the social science teachers, it is observed that they have assigned ‘plain liking for the job’\(3.49\) a rank higher than ‘desire to serve humanity’\(3.64\). Even the factor of ‘chance for self-expression’\(3.33\) has been placed next to the top ranked factor, ‘inspired by teachers in contact during educational carrier’\(2.85\). The rest of the factors follow the overall pattern of ranking. But in between the male and the female teachers in this group, there are some variations observed. While male teachers tend to place the factor, ‘desire to serve humanity,’ higher than ‘chance for self-expression,’ female teachers have assigned first and second ranks to factors such as ‘chance for self-expression’\(2.73\) and ‘plain liking for the job’\(2.84\) respectively. In their case, the outlook appears to be a mix of rational and affective orientations. This is likely to happen in the society which is in transition from traditional to a modern one.

In the case of professional teachers, the ranking pattern of factors motivating them to join this profession is same as indicated by the overall mean score values. Among them, in the case of males, the factor ‘desire for
recognition in the society' (4.27) has been ranked next to 'chance for self-expression' (3.18). However, in the case of female teachers 'plain liking for the job' (3.57) has been ranked higher than 'chance for self-expression' (3.71). Even 'fascination for professional status in the society' has been placed next to 'plain liking for the job' and before 'chance for self-expression'. In fact, they have assigned second rank to 'plain liking for the job'. It again shows that female teachers are more affective than rationalistic in their orientation.

In respect of college teachers, we observe a slightly different pattern of ranking of factors motivating them to go in for the teaching profession than that given by the university teachers. In their overall ranking pattern, they have given first rank to 'desire to serve humanity' (2.98) followed by 'inspired by teachers in contact during educational career' (3.21) and 'fascination for professional status in the society' as a third ranking factor. 'Desire for recognition in the society' and 'chance for self-expression' have been assigned fourth and fifth rank respectively whereas 'plain liking for the job' has been given the sixth rank. 'Better prospects to go abroad' and 'no other option in terms of a career' have been assigned the same ranking positions as given by the university teachers, that is, the seventh and the eighth rank respectively. However, in the case of the Government College teachers, they have given a higher ranking to 'chance for self-expression' and 'plain liking for the job,' than 'desire for recognition in the society'. A sex-wise analysis of teachers in this college shows that male teachers have assigned first rank to 'fascination for professional status in the society' (2.30) whereas female teachers have placed 'plain liking for the job' and 'chance for self-expression' (4.38) higher than 'desire for recognition in the society' (4.69). It shows that females are more affective than male teachers, though most of them have rationalistic orientations towards these factors.
In the case of Private college, we observe that teachers have assigned the first rank to 'inspired by teachers in contact during educational career' (2.94) while 'better prospects to go abroad' (6.68) has been ranked last and 'no other option in terms of a career' has been assigned the seventh rank. The sex-wise response of teachers in this college shows that 'plain liking for the job' has been assigned a higher rank than 'desire for recognition in the society' by the male teachers. Even 'no other option in terms of a career' has been placed higher than 'better prospects to go abroad'. On the other hand, the female teachers have assigned first rank to 'inspired by teachers in contact during educational career' while 'fascination for professional status in the society' gets second position and 'desire for recognition in the society' has been assigned a third rank. Interestingly, 'desire to serve humanity' has been placed at fourth position. The factor 'inspired by teachers in contact during educational career' apart from having rationalistic orientation in terms of following the dedication and role-commitment of teacher, has also an element of affectivity as one tends to empathize with him/her to imbibe such a value.

In short, the above analysis suggests that teachers, by and large, being educated are rationalistic and universalistic in giving ranks to various motivating factors, though they, especially females, have some element of affectivity in their orientations. Another observation is that there are varied responses given by teachers on sex-basis to factors motivating them to take up this profession in the different faculties in the university as well as in the two colleges.

(6) REGRETS BY TEACHERS FOR HAVING JOINED THIS PROFESSION

The respondents were asked to specify whether they had any regret for having joined this profession or not. As revealed by Table 3.7, the majority of teachers in the university (54.54%) stated that they rarely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(35.90)</td>
<td>(26.31)</td>
<td>(32.76)</td>
<td>(25.80)</td>
<td>(36.0)</td>
<td>(30.36)</td>
<td>(63.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(42.59)</td>
<td>(63.16)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(64.52)</td>
<td>(64.0)</td>
<td>(64.29)</td>
<td>(18.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20.51)</td>
<td>(10.53)</td>
<td>(17.24)</td>
<td>(9.68)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(5.35)</td>
<td>(18.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures within brackets represent percentages
experienced regrets for having joined the teaching profession. Further, as many as, 34.09% of them mentioned that they had never felt any regrets for taking up this profession. Only 15(11.37%) teachers stated that they sometimes felt so, while none of them responded to the ‘often’ category. Teachers belonging to science, social science and professional courses have responded more or less in the same proportion as all the teachers in the combined form except in the case of professional teachers who have responded to a higher proportion in the ‘never’ category. Even in this group, there is a higher proportion of male than female teachers for the ‘never’ category and vice-versa is the case in the ‘rarely’ category. Again, among the social science teachers, there is a higher proportion of female than male teachers in the ‘never’ category. But in the case of science teachers, though we have a higher proportion of male teachers in the ‘never’ and ‘sometimes’ categories, yet we have a large proportion of female teachers in the response category of ‘rarely’.

In the colleges, also, we have got similar responses. A higher number of teachers (28) were opting for the response category of ‘rarely’ whereas 9 mentioned that they had ‘never’ regretted their choice while 8 impressed that they regretted ‘sometimes’ for having joined this profession. More female than male teacher in the Government college have responded to the category of ‘rarely’. However, all female but none of the male teachers in the Private college, stated that they ‘sometimes’ felt regretful for having joined this profession. It appears that more female than male teachers seem to have some element of regret for having taken up this profession.

2. VIEWS OF TEACHERS ON VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE PROFESSION

The teachers were asked to specify their views on various aspects of the profession such as not being up to one’s expectations, not providing high social status etc. An examination of Table 3.8, reveals that out of 132
Table 3.8
Views of Teachers on various aspects of the Profession

Note: i) These responses are from only those respondents who have responded to this question.
   ii) * Multiple responses.
   iii) Figures within brackets represent percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Aspects of profession</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N=81)</td>
<td>Male (N=23)</td>
<td>Male (N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female (N=51)</td>
<td>Female (N=13)</td>
<td>Female (N=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (N=132)</td>
<td>Total (N=36)</td>
<td>Total (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>34 (41.97)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (27.52)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 (63.37)</td>
<td>12 (52.17)</td>
<td>12 (48.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>This profession is not up to one’s expectation</td>
<td>21 (25.92)</td>
<td>8 (34.00)</td>
<td>29 (62.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (15.68)</td>
<td>11 (46.15)</td>
<td>17 (71.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 (39.62)</td>
<td>37 (163.64)</td>
<td>68 (274.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does not provide high social status</td>
<td>16 (19.75)</td>
<td>10 (21.27)</td>
<td>26 (52.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.60)</td>
<td>(19.69)</td>
<td>(39.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (10.00)</td>
<td>7 (25.93)</td>
<td>16 (59.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is not well paid</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>1 (25.00)</td>
<td>2 (50.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (25.00)</td>
<td>3 (58.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (30.00)</td>
<td>3 (25.00)</td>
<td>6 (50.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Interferes in meeting family obligations</td>
<td>3 (3.70)</td>
<td>4 (7.84)</td>
<td>7 (13.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.84)</td>
<td>(13.04)</td>
<td>(12.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.30)</td>
<td>(10.00)</td>
<td>(14.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>9 (11.11)</td>
<td>9 (11.63)</td>
<td>18 (39.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(specified as below)</td>
<td>(17.64)</td>
<td>(13.63)</td>
<td>(28.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (7.69)</td>
<td>1 (7.69)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (8.69)</td>
<td>3 (8.69)</td>
<td>4 (16.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (4.54)</td>
<td>4 (16.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (18.18)</td>
<td>4 (18.18)</td>
<td>6 (26.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.30)</td>
<td>(13.30)</td>
<td>(26.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Male Teachers
i) Fully satisfied and contented with the profession.
ii) Does not provide any power and special cadre in the administrative set-up.
iii) Status of university teacher is being diluted because of college teachers being clubbed with them in the UGC Grade.
iv) The profession has not been adopted by majority by choice.

University Female Teachers
i) Gives one self-respect, dignity and satisfaction.
ii) Politics by senior faculty members blocks opportunity for growth of the younger faculty members.
iii) Lacks honesty of purpose and has not evolved a professional work ethic.
iv) Profession should be more creative, innovative and practical.
v) It is being assessed in terms of monetary values.

College Male Teachers
i) The profession provides full satisfaction.

College Female Teachers
i) Best profession for women as it is a noble profession.
ii) Educational system requires drastic streamlining as it is ignored by the administrative set-up.
iii) This profession lacks opportunity for personal advancement, is not challenging, lacks creativity and is monotonous.
teachers in the university sample as many as 56 (42.42%) did not respond to this question. Twenty nine (21.96%) stated that this profession was not upto their expectations, 26 (19.69%) felt that it did not provide high social status, 21 (15.90%) responded that it was not a well paid profession, while 7 stated that it interfered in meeting family obligations. As many as 18 of them specified other reasons given in the table (In view of small number of responses, these have been grouped together in respect of male and female teachers. Moreover, these are multiple responses).

The sex-wise analysis of teachers in the university shows that a higher proportion of female (23.52%) than male (11.10%) teachers expressed that it was not a well-paid profession. Again, a higher proportion of female than male teachers felt that it interfered in meeting their family obligations. In the case of college teachers, more number of them (17) expressed that it did not provide high social status. Further, as many as 14 of them mentioned that this profession was not upto their expectations. Besides, 7 of them mentioned that it was not a well-paid profession while 4 expressed that it interfered in meeting family obligations. Most of the teachers responding to this category were females. Responses of teachers to “any other category” as given in the table are self-explanatory. The underlying emphasis is in making this profession more creative, innovative and practical.

(1) RECOGNITION OF SERVICES RENDERED BY TEACHERS

The teachers were asked to specify whether the services rendered by them were being recognized in the society or not. The responses of teachers were classified in terms of i) very definitely, ii) In most respects, iii) In some respects and iv) not at all. Those who responded to the last category were also asked to give reasons for their reply.

As revealed by Table 3.9, out of 132 university teachers in our study, a larger proportion of them 53(40.15%) felt that their services were
Table 3.9
Outlook of Teachers towards recognition of services rendered by them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition of services of teachers</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (12.00)</td>
<td>13 (11.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 (16.67)</td>
<td>3 (23.33)</td>
<td>10 (20.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>1 (10.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17 (16.67)</td>
<td>6 (25.00)</td>
<td>23 (20.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3 (30.00)</td>
<td>2 (20.00)</td>
<td>5 (41.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20 (16.00)</td>
<td>8 (20.00)</td>
<td>28 (20.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "Not at all" Reasons:

**Male Teachers**
- i) Teachers are not dedicated to the cause of teaching.
- ii) Universities are dens of politics.
- iii) Materialism has overtaken ethics of morality as teaching is not now a public service like only other service.
- iv) Poor conduct of teachers and poor student teacher/society interaction.

**Female Teachers**
- i) Bureaucratic procedures for academic activities hamper growth of teachers.
- ii) Output in not result-oriented and there is devaluation of education in general.
- iii) There is bureaucratization of education and there are different syllabus for entrance tests.
- iv) Teacher is not taken into confidence for educational policy and is treated just as an employee.
- v) Students expect too much from the teachers.

Note: Figures within brackets represent percentages.
being recognized ‘in some respects’ while another 51 (38.64%) expressed that these were being recognized ‘in most respects’. Another 24 (18.18%) thought that these were being recognized ‘very definitely’. Only 4 mentioned that their services were not being recognized “at all”. In respect of science teachers in the university, a higher proportion of female than male teachers have expressed that their services are recognized ‘in some respects’. Again, a higher proportion of female than male teachers in the social science group have expressed that their services are being recognized ‘in some respects’ (44.00%) as well as ‘in most respects’ (40.00%). However, a higher proportion of male (29.03%) than female (12.00%) teachers have stated that their services are being recognized ‘very definitely’. In the case of professional group, more male than female teachers have stated that their services are being recognized ‘in most respects’ and ‘very definitely’ whereas more female than male teachers feel that these are being recognized ‘in some respects’.

As far as college teachers are concerned, a larger proportion of them (18) have opted for ‘in most respects’ whereas 15 have mentioned that these are being recognized ‘in some respects’. As many as 8 of them feel that these are being recognized ‘very definitely’, while 4 of them think that these are not at all being recognized. In between the two colleges, the teachers in Government college, in majority (12) have stated that these are being recognized ‘in most respects’ whereas in the Private college only 6 have opted for it. Again, more female than male teachers in both the colleges have given this option. But, in the overall analysis, a fairly large number of teachers in the university and colleges are not very much satisfied with the recognition given to them for their services. As regards those who responded to the ‘not at all’ category, by and large, they feel that teachers are not dedicated to the cause of teaching and universities have become dens of politics. Besides, there is bureaucratization of education.
Table 3.10  
Relationship between the Academic Level Index of Teachers and the extent of recognition of their services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Academic Level Index</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science (Mean Score Value)</td>
<td>Social Science (Mean Score Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>High (23 and above score)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Low (22 and below score)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and students expect too much from the teachers especially at the college level.

(2) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC LEVEL INDEX AND THE RECOGNITION OF THEIR SERVICES

An attempt was made to relate the academic level index of teachers and the extent of recognition of their services in the society. A score of 3 was assigned to those who responded to the category of ‘very definitely’ whereas a score of 2 and 1, were given to those who responded to the category of ‘in most respects’ and ‘in some respects’ respectively. Those who responded that their services were not being recognized at all were given a score of 0. A mean score value was worked out for the teachers in the high and low academic level index both for the university (faculty-wise) and the two colleges.

As revealed by Table 3.10, among the university teachers, there appears some positive relationship between the academic level index of teachers and the recognition of their services in the society. The teachers with a high academic level index have a higher mean score value (1.83) indicating a larger extent of recognition of their services than those with a low academic level index, the mean score value being 1.58. Even the faculty-wise analysis shows that teachers in the science, social sciences and professional streams with a high academic level index (mean score values of 1.81, 1.78 and 2.20 respectively) express that their services as teachers are recognized more than those with low academic level index (mean score values of 1.44, 1.60, 1.92 respectively for science, social science and professional groups). Even in the case of college teachers it is observed that teachers with a high academic level index feel that their services are being recognized more (mean score value 1.70) than those with the low academic level index (mean score value 1.67). However, if we take into account the mean score values for the Government and the Private college teachers separately, the positive relationship between the
## Table 3.11

Relationship between Family Social Status Index of Teachers and the extent of recognition of their services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Social Status Index</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science (Mean Score Value)</td>
<td>Social Science (Mean Score Value)</td>
<td>Professional (Mean Score Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High (18-24 score)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium (10-16 score)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low (4-10 score)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
academic level index of teachers and the extent of recognition of their services in the society is clearly indicated for the teachers in the Government college, whereas in the case of the Private college, it is not so.

However, on the basis of the overall analysis for the university and college teachers, there is some positive relationship shown by the academic level index of teachers and the extent of recognition of their services in the society. In other words, those with a high academic level index are more positive about it. This lends support to our hypothesis that the academic level index of teachers influences the recognition of services rendered by them in the society.

(3) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FAMILY SOCIAL STATUS INDEX (F.S.S.I) OF TEACHERS AND THE RECOGNITION OF THEIR SERVICES

An attempt was also made to show whether the Family Social Status Index of teachers had any influence on the recognition of their services in the society. A score of 3 was assigned to those who responded to the category ‘very definitely’, a score of 2 for those who stated in most respects’. A score of 1 to those who mentioned ‘in some respects’ and a score of 0 to ‘not at all’ category. The extent of recognition of their services was worked out by finding out the mean score values, for each of these responses, in respect of both the university (faculty-wise) and the college teachers having High, Medium and Low Family Social Status Index.

As indicated in Table 3.11, in the case of university teachers, there is no clear cut relationship between the Family Social Status Index of teachers and the extent of recognition of their services in the society. In fact, teachers with the Medium F.S.S.I (mean score value of 1.82) have shown more positive relationship than those with a low F.S.S.I (1.75). However, those teachers with a high F.S.S.I show least relationship (1.39) in this regard. Even, the faculty wise analysis shows that there is no clear
Views of Teachers on whether they can play an important Role in the Society or not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teachers</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Can play a role in the society</th>
<th>Cannot play a role in the society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(100.0) (00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0) (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in brackets represent percentages
indication of any direct relationship between the above two variables. Infact, teachers in the professional group exhibit an inverse relationship between the level of F.S.S.I and the extent of recognition of their services in the society.

However, in the case of college teachers taken together, there is a positive relationship between the level of F.S.S.I and the recognition of their services in the society. In other words, those with a High F.S.S.I show more positive relationship about this than those in the Medium and Low F.S.S.I groups. In between the two colleges, there appears no clear cut relationship between the level of F.S.S.I of teachers and the extent of their services being recognized. It may be that teachers in the university with a Medium or Low F.S.S.I than those with a High F.S.S.I, have experienced an upward social mobility, as such they may show more positive relationship between their status and the recognition of their services in the society. In the case of college teachers, it is just possible that they may have lower expectation level than the university teachers. As such, they may tend to show more positive relationship between the above two factors.

3) CAN TEACHERS PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE SOCIETY?

Can teachers play an important role in the society? This question was asked from the teachers in the university and colleges. As revealed by Table 3.12, all teachers in the university except 3 males in the science and 4 males in social sciences stream of courses as well as all teachers in the colleges, expressed that they could play an important role in the society.

All those who responded positively to the above question were further asked to specify the ways in which the work of the teachers could be useful to the society.

An examination of Table 3.13, reveals that the majority of teachers in the university (60.80%) state that teachers can be useful to the society by
Table 3.13
Ways in which the work of the Teachers can be useful to the Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Ways in which teachers can play a role</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th>Combined Total of Colleges (N=45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Total (N=125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>By upholding human values</td>
<td>Male (N=36)</td>
<td>Female (N=19)</td>
<td>Total (N=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55.55)</td>
<td>(42.10)</td>
<td>(50.90)</td>
<td>(70.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>By providing a role-model or conformity for others</td>
<td>Male (N=36)</td>
<td>Female (N=19)</td>
<td>Total (N=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47.22)</td>
<td>(52.63)</td>
<td>(49.09)</td>
<td>(59.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.55)</td>
<td>(30.55)</td>
<td>(36.36)</td>
<td>(36.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>By providing direction and leadership to society</td>
<td>Male (N=36)</td>
<td>Female (N=19)</td>
<td>Total (N=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.55)</td>
<td>(26.36)</td>
<td>(36.36)</td>
<td>(44.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Any other (as specified below)</td>
<td>Male (N=36)</td>
<td>Female (N=19)</td>
<td>Total (N=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.11)</td>
<td>(10.50)</td>
<td>(11.11)</td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males
i) Nation building.
ii) By inculcating rational thinking among students.
iii) By transmitting knowledge and guidance to students to prepare them to become engineers and doctors.

Females
i) Career building of students and nation building.

Note: i) Figures in brackets represent percentages.
ii) Multiple Responses.
upholding human values. A higher proportion of teachers with social science and professional background than those with science background, have opted for this response. Although there is not much difference in the proportion of responses between male and female teachers in the social science category, yet we observe a higher proportion of male than female teachers in science and more female than male teachers in the professional category, expressing the same. Besides, as many as 50.40% of teachers have suggested that they can be useful to the society by providing a role model of conformity for others. There appears not much difference in the responses faculty-wise as well as sex-wise within each faculty, except that a higher proportion of male than female teachers in the social science category, have given this reply. Further, it is observed by 48.80% teachers that they can be useful to the society by being innovative and creative in tackling societal problems. A higher proportion of teachers with social science and professional background than those with science background have given this response. Again, a higher proportion of female than male teachers in social science and science backgrounds that those in the professional group have answered so. Another 40.00% of teachers feel that they can be useful to the society by providing direction and leadership. A higher proportion of teachers in social science (44.23%) than those with professional (38.88%) and science (36.36%) backgrounds feel so. The sex-wise analysis within each faculty shows that a higher proportion of female (47.36%) than male teachers (30.55%) in the science group and more male (5) than female (2) teachers in the professional group are for this response whereas in the case of social science teachers, there is no difference on sex basis. Besides, they have also suggested that teachers can help in nation building and in the career making of students.

On the other hand, in the case of college teachers, we observe that a large majority of them (64.44%) feel that they can be useful to the society
by upholding human values. This is followed by teachers (57.77%) who believe that they can be useful to the society by providing direction and leadership to the society, while the next factor highlighted by them is ‘by providing a role model of conformity for others’ (53.33%). The rest of the responses are same in the order as that given by the university teachers. In between the two colleges, the teachers in the Government college as compared to those in the Private college have mentioned in greater number, factors such as ‘providing direction and leadership to society’ and ‘being innovative and creative in tackling societal problems’ through which they can be useful to the society. Sex-wise in both the colleges, more female than male teachers have opted for ‘being innovative and creative in tackling societal problems’. It is further suggested by teachers that they can act as a change agent to the society and set examples for others to follow. As compared to university, college teachers are more positive about their role in providing direction and leadership to the society.

(4) FACTORS THAT RAISE THE STATUS OF TEACHERS IN THE SOCIETY

As professionals, teachers have to acquire a status in the society. A set of eight factors was provided to university and college teachers and they were asked to rank these in order of their preferences, for raising their status in the society. A score of one was assigned to a factor ranked first while a score of two was given to a factor ranked second. In the same way, the factors ranked from third to eighth positions were assigned a score accordingly. A mean score value was worked out for each of these factors faculty and sex-wise for the university teachers as well as sex-wise for the college teachers. An overall mean score value for these factors was worked out for the university and college teachers. In the case of university teachers, a combined score value was also worked out for both the male and the female teachers, in the science, social science and professional
groups while in the case of colleges, a combined mean score for teachers of both the sexes was worked out in respect of the Government and the Private college. The score values were arranged in an ascending order, the lower the mean score value, the higher was the rank assigned to that factor.

An examination of Table 3.14, reveals that in the overall analysis, the university teachers have assigned first rank to 'teaching competence' (1.77) followed by 'setting personal standards of excellence' (2.12), 'research competence' (2.61), 'academic achievements' (3.90), 'popularity with students as a good academician' (4.86), 'active participation in teachers' association' (6.18), 'raising income through various sources' (7.14) and 'active involvement in politics' (7.24), in that order. The faculty-wise analysis suggests that social science and professional teachers have given the same rank order as outlined in the overall analysis. But in the case of science faculty, we observe teachers placing 'active involvement in politics' above 'raising income through various sources'. However, there are differences observed in the ranking of these factors sex-wise in between science and social science teachers.

In the case of science teachers, it is observed that female teachers have placed 'research competence' (2.36) above 'setting personal standards of excellence' (3.00) as a factor contributing towards raising their status in the society. Again, they have given higher rank position to 'active involvement in politics' (7.21) than 'raising income through various sources' (7.31). In the case of social science teachers, male teachers have given a higher rank to 'setting personal standards of excellence' (1.77) than 'teaching competence' (1.83) whereas female teachers have placed 'active involvement in politics' (7.24) above 'raising income through various sources' (7.28). By and large, teachers in the university have shown a rationalistic and individualistic orientation for raising their status in the society. Some of the other teachers especially
Table 3.14
Factors that raise the status of Teachers in the Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Factors raising the status</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University Teachers</th>
<th>Professional Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mean Score Value)</td>
<td>(Mean Score Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teaching competence</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Setting personal standards of excellence.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Research competence</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Popularity with students as a good academician</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Active participation in Teacher's association</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Raising income through various courses</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Active involvement in politics</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Factors raising the status</th>
<th>Overall Mean Score Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mean Score Value)</td>
<td>(Mean Score Value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Combined Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Combined Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Setting personal standards of Excellence</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teaching competence</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Academic achievements Publications, Foreign assignments etc.)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Popularity with students as a good academician.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Research competence</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Active participation in Teacher’s association</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Active involvement in politics</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Raising Income through various sources</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
females, are also for collective mobilization through teachers' associations and involvement in politics.

On the other hand, in the overall analysis, college teachers have given a different pattern of ranking of these factors for raising their status in the society than that given by the university teachers. They have assigned first rank to 'setting personal standards of excellence' (1.72). This is followed by 'teaching competence' (1.92), 'academic achievements' (3.83), 'popularity with students as a good academician' (3.88), 'research competence' (4.12), 'active participation in teachers association' (6.05), 'active involvement in politics' (7.01), and 'raising income through various sources' (7.47), in that order. The college-wise analysis suggests that in the case of Government college, teachers have placed 'research competence' (3.51) above 'academic achievements' (3.99). However, in the case of Private college, the factor of 'raising income through various sources' (6.90) has been given a higher rank to 'active involvement in politics' (7.08). The sex-wise analysis of teachers in the Government college shows that male teachers have given a higher rank to 'research competence' (3.70) than 'popularity with students as a good academician' (4.40) and 'academic achievements' (4.50). On the other hand, female teachers have placed 'teaching competence' (1.76) above 'setting personal standards of excellence' (2.00). They have also ranked 'research competence' (3.38) above 'academic achievements' and 'popularity with students as a good academician'. In the case of Private college, again, the 'teaching competence' (1.75) has been ranked above 'setting personal standards of excellence' (1.87) by the male teachers whereas female teachers have given a higher rank to 'raising income through various sources' (6.50) than 'active involvement in politics' (7.35). In view of less or practically no input of research in colleges, the factor of
‘research competence’ has been given a lower rank order than popularity with students.

There is a need to imbibe some of the values such as teaching competence, setting personal standards of excellence, research competence, academic achievements and popularity with students as a good academician by the university and college teachers as a part of their professional role socialization. The acquiring of some of these attributes by the teachers may equip them to have more specialized knowledge, work autonomy and service orientation. These may provide a full fledged professional status to the occupation of teaching in the long run.

To sum up, one may conclude that a fairly large number of teachers had members of their family in this profession. Most of them were having either wife/husband or sister/brother in it. They might have influenced them to join the teaching profession. A few of them had mentioned that they were initially interested in taking up occupations other than teaching. Of these, the most preferred jobs were professional, civil and defence services. Nearly all of them expressed that they enjoyed working in this profession. Besides, the most motivating factors for them to join this profession were ‘inspiration by teachers’, ‘desire to serve humanity’, chance for self-expression’ and ‘fascination for professional status in the society. The majority of teachers either ‘never’ or ‘rarely’ regretted for having joined this profession. Some of them expressed that this profession was not upto their expectations, was not providing high social status and was not well-paid. Besides, female teachers felt that it interfered in meeting their family obligations. Most of them felt that their services as teachers were being recognized in the society. This had some relevance with their academic level index but not so clearly with their F.S.S.I. Nearly all of them expressed that they could play an important role in the society by upholding human values, providing a role model of conformity for
others, being innovative and creative and providing leadership to society. In their opinion, the most significant factors that can raise their status in the society are teaching competence, setting personal standards of excellence, research competence, academic achievements and perhaps popularity with students as a good academician.