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1. INTRODUCTION

CONCEPT OF SFS LECTURERS

SFS lecturers are those lecturers who are appointed on those posts which are financed by the funds generated from those courses which they are teaching. In case of SFS posts no funds are provided by either central or state governments. Hence the managements of these self finance or private higher education institutions are paying such lecturers only out of funds generated by them. Not only private rather many of the aided colleges are also having SFS lecturers. The reasons behind this are two-fold. In aided colleges there are many vocational courses for which govt. provide no aid. These courses are sanctioned by the relevant university only under the “self finance scheme”. So the lecturers appointed to teach such courses are also covered under SFS. In many states the govt. is scrapping the covered posts of those lecturers who are getting retired. When a lecturer retires from a covered post, in his/her place a temporary or SFS lecturer is appointed and the covered post lying vacant is scrapped. Behind such scrapping of covered posts the state govt. gives the plea of shortage of funds.

STATUS OF SFS LECTURERS IN INDIA

The lecturers appointed under ‘SFS’ are deprived of many benefits which are offered to a permanent/regular lecturer. The SFS lecturers are not only getting very less salary due to the self finance nature of their job rather they are suffering on other grounds also. List of some of the cries of SFS lecturers is as follows.

i) Inadequate remuneration
ii) Job insecurity
iii) Lack of recognition
iv) Excess work load
v) Low social status
vi) Inadequate leave facility
vii) Unhealthy working environment
viii) No refresher or orientation courses
ix) No UGC sponsored research work
x) General biased ness
xi) No maternity benefits
xii) Lack of provisions with regard to increments in salary

xiii) No promotions

xiv) Appearing in interviews times & again

All these factors collectively are responsible for the poor status of SFS lecturers in India. The more tragic fact is that with the passage of time the number of SFS lecturers is rising. In the present scenario we can also see that in almost all of the aided colleges the higher proportion of the lecturers is covered under SFS. In my study the districts Faridabad and Palwal are covered which are having five aided colleges and approximately 15 unaided institutes. In these colleges the tentative number of permanent and SFS lecturers is as given below:

*All the institutes are running under unaided or/SFS. There is no provision of state sanctioned post

Table: 1 Number of permanent and SFS lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the college</th>
<th>No. of teachers on sanctioned post</th>
<th>No. of teachers under SFS (Tentative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAV Centenary college, FBD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLM dayanand college, FBD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggarwal College Ballabgarh</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarswati Mahila College Palwal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S D College Palwal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives of the study

The main objective of the study is to see the job satisfaction level of the lecturers appointed under SFS in aided colleges and private educational institutes of higher education.

- To study the difference in the level of Job satisfaction of SFS lecturers working in aided colleges and Private institutes of higher education.
- Measures to enhance the morale of these lecturers

Research Methodology

Data sources

This study is based on the primary and secondary data. The field of the study is Aided colleges and institutes of Faridabad and Palwal district. There are total five colleges and more than 10 institutes in these districts. The researcher has collected the primary data from all these colleges’ and institutes lecturers who are the respondents of the study, and secondary data is collected from the published articles, research papers, magazines, newspapers, books and different websites etc.

Sample design

The study was implemented to the two districts of Haryana namely Faridabad and Palwal. There are five aided colleges in these two districts and more than 15 institutes are running under SFS of privatized regime. These all are affiliated to the MDU Rohtak. Here teachers are appointed under permanent, contractual and purely adhoc basis. Total 200 questionnaires were sent to the respondents of the study 100 each to aided and unaided higher educational institutes. Researcher found difficulty to get filled questionnaire from unaided private institutes that’s why only 30 respondents filled the questionnaire of this category, while 70 respondents gave their responses from aided colleges. The demographic of the respondents are given as under:

SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

The study is based on random Stratified sampling and the sample size is 100. It is chosen from all the respondents of different college/Institutes, lecturers of Faridabad and Palwal Distt.

HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION:

H0: There is no difference of job satisfaction level between different college lecturers working under SFS and lecturers working Private institutes of higher education.
TECHNIQUES FOR ANALYSIS USED IN THE STUDY

For the sake of analysis SPSS tools and techniques are used in the study. To achieve the objectives due care and caution is taken to analyze the data. Following techniques are used in the study:

- T test is used to test the satisfaction level of lecturers working in aided colleges and Private institutes of higher education.
- Graphical presentation is also used wherever it is required.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- There is reluctance on the part of respondents regarding disclosure of their identity and name of the institutes.
- There may be general level of biasedness among respondents.
- Perception can vary due to the intellectual level and understanding level of the respondents.
- There is a difference in terms of working conditions, appointment and environment among different colleges and institutes.
- Researcher found great difficulty in getting the questionnaire filled by teachers of private institutes. The reason may be due to fear of disclosing information to the college management. That’s why the ratio of private institutions respondent is quite low as compared to the aided college.

PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE SFS TEACHERS VS. TEACHERS WORKING WITH PRIVATE INSTITUTES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The teachers in the study belong to the Private Institutes and the Colleges. The objective of the study is to compare the job satisfaction level of the teachers working with the private institutes and the colleges. The independent samples (or two-sample) t-test is used to compare the means of two independent samples (institute teachers and college teachers). The assumption of the independent sample T test is:

- The dependent variable is normally distributed.
- The two groups have approximately equal variance on the dependent variable.
- The two groups are independent of one another.

The formula for the t-test is a ratio. The top part of the ratio is just the difference between the two means or averages. The bottom part is a measure of the variability or dispersion of the scores. The t statistic in the independent sample t test can be calculated as follows:

\[
t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}
\]
Where, \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) are the means of two independent samples, \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) are the standard deviations of the two samples, \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) are the sample size of the samples.

**Analysis for perception of institute teachers and college teachers regarding different aspects of their job**

Table 2 Independent Sample T test for perception of institute teachers and college teachers regarding different aspects of their job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Private Institute</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-Statistic (p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary is not justified as per qualification, experience, achievement and nature of importance of profession</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not feel any kind of motivation for achieving further excellence in studies</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel frustrated when saw other teachers working on regular basis, paid far better than us</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel embarrassed while reveal status of our employment in society</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissatisfaction of teachers under SFS adversely affects their commitment and involvement towards organization</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The fellow lecturers at permanent posts disrespect our dignity and make us feel inferior.</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissatisfaction of teachers under SFS scheme distorts the quality of higher education.</strong></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the independent sample t test are shown below. The results indicate that teachers in the private institute are better in terms of salary and motivation. The college teachers feel that they are less paid hence are suffering from embarrassment and demotivation.
PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AND PRIVATE INSTITUTE TEACHERS REGARDING DIFFERENT DISSATISFACTORY FACTORS

Table: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-Statistic (p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Pay Scale</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>0.779 (0.438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Job Security</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>1.439 (0.155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Work Load</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>4.491 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Leave facility</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>2.095 (0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Working Hours</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>3.309 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clears that low pay scale and no job security factors carry same perception between both types of teachers as there is no significant difference between both types of teachers. While there is a significant difference in the perception of the said teachers regarding work load, leave facility, working hours. So low salary and job insecurity are the most dissatisfying factors accepted by all.

PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AND PRIVATE INSTITUTE TEACHERS REGARDING DIFFERENT MOTIVATING FACTORS
Table : 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College/private institute</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-Statistic (p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handsome Salary</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>(0.444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>2.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Facility</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>(0.797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC Norms</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Extra Work</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>2.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Incentives</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>1.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>(0.234)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table following statistical inferences are drawn that there is no difference in the perception of both types of teachers regarding handsome salary, leave facility UGC/AICTE norms as motivating factors while there is a significant difference in the perception of said lecturers regarding job security & extra work as teachers in private institutes feel more secured and are less burdened.
PERCEPTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AND PRIVATE INSTITUTE TEACHERS REGARDING DIFFERENT SUGGESTED MEASURES

Table: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If SFS lecturers are not getting the benefits of UGC norms ,the condition of UGC/AICTE as to minimum stay,eligibility etc should not be applicable to them</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC/AICTE should set a separate set of guidelines for SFS lecturers regarding their eligibility, appointments, promotions, increments and other job benefits</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC/AICTE should made it mandatory for educational institution to have majority of their total faculty on permanent basis</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the case of regular lecturers state govt. should also provide grant to finance the post of contractual lecturers</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Institute</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the measures are accepted universally by the private and the college teachers. There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of different type of teachers that UGC/AICTE should take steps regarding above said all measures

Conclusions

Job satisfaction is a very important factor for the quality of higher education. Dissatisfied teachers are less committed and less involved. Their dissatisfaction demotivate them in their
profession. It is accepted by the respondents that dissatisfaction is one of the important causes for
the non commitment of teachers towards their teaching. The study finds that low pay scale and
no job security factors carry same perception between both types of teachers, while there is a
significant difference in the perception of the said teachers regarding work load, leave facility
and working hours. Low salary and job insecurity are the most dissatisfying factors it is
accepted by all. So it is a threat to the quality of higher education and Govt., /UGC/AICTE
should take some strict steps regarding the terms and conditions of such appointment for twofold
effect i.e. to enhance the satisfaction level and to improve the quality of higher education.
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