



ISSN: 2319-6505

Available Online at <http://journalijcar.org>

International Journal of Current Advanced Research  
Vol 5, Issue 12, pp 1576-1580, December 2016

**International Journal  
of Current Advanced  
Research**

ISSN: 2319 - 6475

RESEARCH ARTICLE

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS OF TEACHER'S PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AMONG GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE TEACHERS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

**Pramod Kumar Naik\*, Atindra Nath Dutta and Yogamaya Samanta**

Dr. C.V. Raman University, Kota, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article History:**

Received 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2016  
Received in revised form 7<sup>th</sup> October, 2016  
Accepted 16<sup>th</sup> November, 2016  
Published online 28<sup>th</sup> December, 2016

**Key words:**

Teacher's Participation, School Administration, Government and Private Teachers, Secondary Schools.

**ABSTRACT**

Besides teaching, an important part in professional workplaces is to participate in various areas of school administration. School teachers' participation, from all sectors of this field of teaching, in the school administration makes teachers to gain a lot of professional experiences, reinforce the teacher and increase self-confidence in job, job efficiency, commitment towards job, job efficiency and job efficiency. The researchers chose this current study of teachers' participation in school administration in relation to nature of school, teaching experience and their teaching subjects. The researchers took "simple random sampling" as the sampling technique for collecting data from 100 teachers, including males and females, of secondary schools. The researchers used "Teacher's Participation in School Administration Scale" for the tool of data collection. This scale was developed by Haseen Taj (2000). The researchers chose 8 secondary level schools of Bilha and Kota Blocks of Bilaspur district in Chhattisgarh. The researchers collected the data and analysed by using statistical techniques by using mean, SD, SED and t-test. The study focused to reveal that there is significant differences in some dimensions of teacher's participation like communicating, evaluating or controlling among government and private secondary school teachers in their participation in school administration but in some the dimensions like planning and organizing the researchers found no differences.

© Copy Right, Research Alert, 2016, Academic Journals. All rights reserved.

**INTRODUCTION**

"A school without Teacher is just like a body without the soul, a skeleton without flesh and blood."

Teachers are essentially nation builders. They are the torch-bearers of the race. On them depends the future of the school, village, the country and in fact the humanity in whole. The most important duty of the teacher is classroom instruction along with other duties which the teacher performs, such as managing the pupils, looking after instructional supplies, directing out of class activities of pupils, caring for school facilities, participating in the planning of expenditure, keeping records, making reports and cultivating whole some relations with the community are usually regarded as entirely incidental to the major responsibility of instruction. Such duties challenge the management skill of the teacher.

Educational administration deals with the process of validating purpose and allocating resources to achieve the maximum attainment of purposes with the minimum allocation of resources, it includes the aspects of management of school plant, management of material equipment, management of ideas and principles into school system curriculum, time schedule, norms of achievement, co-curriculum activities. School administration officers oversee the daily operation of schools, colleges, universities, day care centers and preschools. A school administrator's specific responsibilities differ between organizations but often these

administrators are an important link between students and the local communities.

Sarwar (1991) discussed about some of these duties as supervision of assembly, literary society; supervision of student functions; supervision of funds, fee and fines; supervision of discipline and punctuality as day master; supervision of games and sports; supervision of hostel; supervision of library, reading room; supervision of records and registers; supervision of stores; supervision of first aid and supervision of workers. Shahidin 2000 revealed that educational administration deals with the process of validating purposes and allocating resources to achieve the maximum attainment of purposes with the minimum allocation of resources which includes different aspects of management of material equipment, management of school plant, management of human equipment and management of ideas and principles into school system, curriculum, time schedule, norms of achievement, co-curricular activities. According to Udoh and Akpa, 2007, administration is sometimes conceptualized as the job of the school principal, which includes holding together the organization, making progress towards set objectives, and getting things done. It is also the process of organization leadership.

Mullins (2005) looked that many people believed that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance and which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world. Ndu and Anogbogu (2007) also observed

that where teachers are not involved in governance, result the teachers behaving as strangers within the school environment. Thus, most teachers do not put in their best to have full sense of commitment and dedication to the school. Naik, Dutta & Jana (2016) also revealed that there are basic differences in the dimensions teacher participation like planning, organizing, communicating in school administration among male and female teachers.

### **Significance of the study**

The administrative tasks responsibilities, the teachers' performance in schools. The study shows the status of teachers thought about participation and involvement in educational management and administration. It also helps to know the level of teacher's participation in school administration.

Teachers are satisfied and motivated with the participation in educational management. They are very keen and much interested to accept the responsibilities. The teacher has many responsibilities other than teaching, like review subject matters, prepare lesson plans, some of which must be reviewed by as administrator, correct and grade papers, make report cards, sometimes performs menial tasks, supervise lunch rooms, police hallways, keep elaborate students attendance records, make written records to counselor, call parents by telephone and sent letters to parents, keep current in their field of specialization, teach in a context of physical violence in the halls, parking lots and even the classrooms, engage in curriculum planning, arrange for guest speakers, collect money for various funds, represent the school at community meeting, sponsor plays, concert, and assembled hold parent conferences.

Teacher has full responsibility for the day time care of children approximately for the nine or ten months out of each year. Important and significant experiences take place during this time. Teacher should be able to approach the task of evaluation objectively, select suitable evaluation techniques, construct and administer standardized tests, analyses results and integrate the evaluative process into the total process of teaching.

It is truly desirable that the teachers participate actively and willingly in school administrative duties and perform these properly so that the school organization can proceed in an elegant and smooth way to achieve its goals. Gender, locality, age, experience of teachers affect their participation in the duties related to school administration.

So, we see that how teachers' participation works effectively for the positive environment of the school administration. Thus the researcher has selected the problem as "*A Comparative Study of Different Dimensions of Teacher's Participation in School Administration among Government and Private Teachers of Secondary Schools.*"

**Statement of the Problem:** -The problem for the present study is stated as follows:

***"A Comparative Study of Different Dimensions of Teacher's Participation in School Administration among Government and Private Teachers of Secondary Schools."***

### **Objectives of the study**

1. To study teacher's participation in school administration for the dimension of planning among government and private teachers of secondary schools.
2. To study teacher's participation in school administration for the dimension of organizing among government and private teachers of secondary schools.
3. To study teacher's participation in school administration for the dimension of communicating among government and private teachers of secondary schools.
4. To study teacher's participation in school administration for the dimension of controlling among government and private teachers of secondary schools.
5. To study teacher's participation in school administration for the dimension of evaluating among government and private teachers of secondary schools.

### **Hypotheses of the study**

- H<sub>01</sub>** There is no significant mean difference for the planning dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
- H<sub>02</sub>** There is no significant mean difference for the organizing dimension of teacher's participation in school administration government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
- H<sub>03</sub>** There is no significant mean difference for the communicating dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
- H<sub>04</sub>** There is no significant mean difference for the controlling dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
- H<sub>05</sub>** There is no significant mean difference for the evaluating dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

### **Method**

In the present study researchers have used survey method.

### **Sample**

In the present study, the investigators selected the Bilaspur district of the state Chhattisgarh as their field of investigation. Due to limitation of time the investigators had to take a limited number of institutions for data collection. A sample size of 100 of secondary level teachers from eight secondary schools were taken for this purpose. The researchers took 50 government teachers and 50 private teachers from rural and urban schools. For this purpose the researchers used stratified random sampling technique and collected the data in the month of June, 2016.

### **Tool used**

The tool which has been used in this research study is as - "Teacher's Participation in School Administration Scale (TPSAS)"

Teacher's Participation in School Administration Scale (TPSAS) has been developed by Dr. Haseentaj.

This scale has 27 items and these are divided into 5 sections. Each section represents one dimension of teacher's participation in school administration. Among them, 5 items are related to planning, 6 are related to organizing, 07 items related to communicating, 5 items are related to controlling and 04 items are related to evaluating. There are 5 options for each item in the questionnaire as – Always, frequently, occasionally, rarely and never.

The method of answering the questions was according to 5 degree Likert which varies from 5 to 1. The scoring for each option in each item is as following:

Nature of item	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
	5	4	3	2	1

Data were collected individually. The scoring of responses was done in accordance with the scoring key given in the manual. Statistical treatment of obtained data was done to test signification of each hypothesis.

**Statistical Techniques Used**

The scores obtained were subject to statistical treatment using proper statistical techniques. For this purpose Mean, Standard Deviation, t- test, was used. The result so obtained are interpreted and discussed in the light of problem factors to make the result meaningful.

**Variables**

Independent variable: - Government and private teachers of rural and urban area,

Dependent variable: - Teacher's Participation in School Administration.

**Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant mean difference for the planning dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

**Table No. – 01**

Category.	N	Mean	SD	SED	t-test Value	Degree of freedom	Significance Level	Interpretation
Government Teachers	50	16.12	1.762271	0.44081	1.316	98	0.05=>1.98	HO1 Accepted
Private Teachers	50	16.7	2.570992				0.01=>2.62	

**Interpretation of the data**

It is inferred from the table no. – 01 that the calculated 't' value is 1.316, which is lower than the table Value at 0.05 level i.e. 1.98 and at 0.01 level i.e. 2.62. Hence hypothesis no. – 1 "There is no significant mean difference for the planning dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools" is accepted.

**Table No 2**

Category	N	Mean	SD	S <sub>ED</sub>	t-test Value	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level	Interpretation
Government Teachers	50	20.92	2.124523	0.421616	2.562	98	0.05=>1.98	HO2 Accepted
Private Teachers	50	19.84	2.091507				0.01=>2.62	

**RESULT**

It has been found that there is no significant mean difference for the planning dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant mean difference for theorganizing dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

**Interpretation of the data**

It is inferred from the table no. – 02 that the calculated 't' value is 2.562, which is greater than the table value at 0.05 level i.e. 1.98 but less than at 0.01 level i.e. 2.62. Hence hypothesis no. – 2 "There is no significant mean difference for the organizing dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools" is accepted.

**Result:** It has been found that there is nosignificant mean difference for the organizing dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant mean difference for thecommunicating dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

**Interpretation of the data**

It is inferred from the table no. – 03 that the calculated 't' value is 4.9993, which is greater than the table value at 0.05 level i.e. 1.98 and at 0.01 level i.e. 2.62. Hence hypothesis no. – 3 "There is nosignificant mean difference for thecommunicating dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools" is rejected.

**Result:** It has been found that there is a significant mean difference for thecommunicating dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers.

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant mean difference for thecontrolling dimension of teacher's participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

Table No 3

Category.	N	Mean	SD	S <sub>ED</sub>	t-test Value	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level	Interpretation
Government Teachers	50	25.92	2.704367	0.66809	4.9993	98	0.05=>1.98	HO3 Rejected
Private Teachers	50	22.58	3.873448				0.01=>2.62	

Table No 4

Category.	N	Mean	SD	S <sub>ED</sub>	t-test Value	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level	Interpretation
Government Teacher	50	17.34	1.818522	0.36744	7.511	98	0.05=>1.98	HO4 Rejected
Private Teachers	50	14.58	1.855694				0.01=>2.62	

**Interpretation of the data**

It is inferred from the table no. – 04 that the calculated ‘t’ value is 7.511, which is greater than the table value at 0.05 level i.e. 1.98 and also at 0.01 level i.e. 2.62. Hence hypothesis no. – 4 “There is no significant mean difference for thecontrolling dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools” is rejected.

**Result:** It has been found that there is asignificant mean difference for thecontrolling dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers.

**H<sub>05</sub>:** There is no significant mean difference for theevaluating dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

3. There is a significant mean difference for thecommunicating dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
4. There is a significant mean difference for thecontrolling dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
5. There is a significant mean difference for theevaluating dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

Table No 5

Category.	N	Mean	SD	S <sub>ED</sub>	t-test Value	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level	Interpretation
Government Teachers	50	13.62	1.719186	0.32379	6.632	98	0.05=>1.98	HO5 Rejected
Private Teachers	50	11.56	1.512085				0.01=>2.62	

**Interpretation of the data**

It is inferred from the table no. – 05 that the calculated ‘t’ value is 6.632, which is rejected both at the table value at 0.05 level i.e. 1.98 and at 0.01 level i.e. 2.62. Hence hypothesis no. – 5 “There is no significant mean difference for theevaluating dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools” is rejected.

**Result:** It has been found that there is asignificant mean difference for theevaluating dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers.

**Findings**

1. There is no significant mean difference for theplanning dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.
2. There is no significant mean difference for theorganizing dimension of teacher’s participation in school administration among government teachers and private teachers of secondary schools.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of the study have revealed that regarding to teacher’s participation in school administration, there are differences in some dimensions like communicating, controlling and evaluation among government and private teachers but no differences has been found in planning and organizing dimensions. The government teachers whether from rural or urban areas are more involved in school administration in most of the areas than their counterpart.

**CONCLUSION**

The private school teachers should come forward to participate more in school administration and the principal of the school and school management should involve them in the work of school administration so that an equilibrium can be established. In this way, the teaching-learning process and the environment of the school can reach to a desirable context. Thus, the government, school management should conduct researches to find out the causes of differences and lack of organizational commitment.

**References**

**Books**

1. Anagbogu M. (2007), “Framework for Effective Management of University’sin the 21st Century in

- Issues in Higher Education: Research-Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa”.
2. Best J. & Kahn J., (2008), *Research in Education*, Tenth Edition, Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
  3. Kothari, C. R., *Research methodology*, New age international (p) limited, publishers.
  4. Mullins LJ (2005). *Management and Organisational Behaviour*. Seventh edition prenticeHall.
  5. Naik, P.K.(2016), *Research Methodology*, APH Publication, New Delhi.
  6. Shahid, S. M. (2000). *Educational Administration*, Mageed Book Depot, Lahore.
  7. Sarwar M. R. (1991),*Majeed Book Depot,Urdu Bazar, Lahore*.
  8. Udoh S, Akpa G (2007). *Educational Administration in Nigeria. Theory and Practice*.ISBN 978-236-049-X.
- Published Journals**
- Choi Ho D., (2010), “Teacher Participation in Curriculum and Pedagogical Decisions: Insights into Curriculum Leadership”, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38: 613, 2010.
- Duze, Chinelo O., (2011), “Students’ and Teachers’ Participation in Decision-Making and Impact on School Work and School Internal Discipline in Nigeria”, *African Research Review*, Vol. 5 (2), Serial No. 19, April, 2011, 200-214, ISSN 1994-9057 (Print) ISSN 2070-0083 (Online)
- Gayatri R., (2016), “Teacher’s Participation in School Administration and Attitude towards Teaching Profession of Secondary School Teachers”, *Indian Streams Research Journal*, Volume: VI, Issue: I, February – 2016, ISSN No. 2230-7850.
- Göksoy S., (2014), “Participation of Teachers in School Administration and Their Organizational Citizenship Behaviors”, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 4, No. 7; May 2014
- Gumus S., (2013), “The Effects of Teacher and School-Level Factors on Teachers’ Participation in Professional Development Activities: The Role Of Principal Leadership” Mustafa Kemal University, Turkey, *Journal of International Education Research*, Vol. 9, No. 4, Fourth Quarter 2013.
- Mehta D., (2015), “A Study of Teacher’s Participation in Decision Making: Gender Specific Roles” Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India, *European Academic Research*, Vol. II, Issue 11, February 2015, Impact Factor: 3.1 (UIF), ISSN 2286-4822.
- Naik P. K., Dutta A. N. & Jana A., (2016), “A Comparative Study of Different Dimensions of Teacher’s Participation in School Administration among Government and Private Teachers of Secondary Schools”, *International Journal of Advanced Research (IJAR)*, Vol. 4, Issue 31, October, 2016, ISSN No. 2320-5407.
- Olorunsola E. &Olayemi A., (2011), “Teachers participation in decision making process insecondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria”, *International Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies* Vol. 3(6), pp. 78-84, June 2011, ISSN 2141 – 6656
- Rathee I., (2015), “Study of Participation in School Administration of Residential and Non-Residential School Teachers in Relation to their Teaching Subject and Experience” Associate Professor, Tika Ram College of Education, Sonapat (Haryana), India, *International Educational E-Journal Quarterly*, Volume-IV, Issue-III, 2015, ISSN 2277-2456.
- Yousuf M., Parveen Q, Arshad M., (2013), “Teachers’ Participation in School Administration at Elementary Schools of Punjab”, *Educational Research International*, Vol. 2, No. 3, ISSN 2307 – 3721

\*\*\*\*\*