C H A P T E R -VI

MANAGEMENT OF I. I. T

6.1 GOVERNANCE OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

6.2 EXISTING PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION - MAKING.

6.3 EXPECTED PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION - MAKING

6.4 DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EXISTING AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

6.5 ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM - III

6.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

6.7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

6.8 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

CHAPTER : VI

MANAGEMENT OF I.I.T.

This Chapter covers the objective No.III given in the second chapter. Governance of the Education System-III has been studied on the basis of documentry records and informal interview with the members of the system. Scording processes for O.H.Q. Decision-making participation instruments (Existing and Expected) have been adopted as per the guidelines established for this purpose in chapter third. Three main variables have been considered: Organizational Health of the Education System : Decisional participation (Existing); Decisional participation (Expected). Organizational health contains ten dimensions. For convinience point of view, following code have been used in doing statistical analysis:

Variable 1 Dimension-I of the Organizational Health
Variable 2 Dimension-II of the Organizational Health
Variable 3 Dimension-III of the Organizational Health
Variable 4 Dimension-IV of the Organizational Health
Variable 5 Dimension-V of the Organizational Health
Variable 6 Dimension-VI of the Organizational Health
Variable 7 Dimension-VII of the Organizational Health
Variable 8 Dimension-VIII of the Organizational Health

Variable 9 Dimension-IX of the Organizational Health

Variable 10 Dimension-X of the Organizational Health

Variable 11 for total score (all dimensions combined) of the Organizational Health.

Variable 12 for Decisional participation (Existing)

Variable 13 for Decisional participation (Expected)

In various tables, while showing means, standard deviations etc., these code numbers for different variables have been used frequently.

Forty decision situations are given in the Decision-making participation instruments alongwith category of responses. Forty, items of Organizational Health Questionnaire are also given with reference to the dimensions in Chapter-III.

Table VI-1 : Categorywise percentages of respondents (Professors) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System-III						N=30				
Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1	3	17	30	40	10	40	30	13	7	10
2	3	23	37	17	20	27	50	10	10	3
3	10	20	13	37	20	13	17	37	23	10
4	13	40	7	20	20	43	27	27	3	0
5	7	33	13	27	20	43	20	27	10	0
6	17	17	23	30	13	47	13	30	10	0
7	0	33	17	37	13	37	40	23	0	0
8	3	17	10	40	30	50	20	27	3	0
9	3	17	17	33	30	40	30	27	3	0
10	3	13	17	47	20	27	40	27	3	3
11	33.5	30	23.5	3	10	57	23	20	0	0
12	37	33	20	10	0	50	27	17	3	3
13	43	20	10	27	0	33	30	17	10	10
14	27	17	30	23	3	37	30	13	20	0
15	20	13	13	37	17	20	20	27	20	13
16	17	6.5	6.5	30	40	10	13	30	30	17
17	3	13	7	43.5	33.5	10	40	20	13	17
18	0	7	13	30	50	10	7	30	20	33
19	17	13	30	30	10	40	17	17	13	13
20	23	27	30	7	13	23	37	20	13	7

contd....

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21	17	20	10	33	20	30	13	37	10	10
22	36.5	26.5	7	10	20	40	30	13.5	13.5	3
23	13.5	23	20	30	13.5	37	33	27	3	0
24	27	30	20	13	10	47	26.5	16.5	10	0
25	10	40	20	20	10	37	43	17	3	0
26	13	17	20	30	20	37	43	17	3	0
27	7	7	3	30	53	3	7	17	36.5	36.5
28	3.5	3.5	7	33	53	3	7	13.5	33.5	43
29	0	10	7	33	50	3.5	3.5	13	27	53
30	0	10	17	33	50	17	13	27	33	20
31	0	0	3	37	60	13	20	27	17	23
32	0	3.5	3.5	33	60	10	30	20	13	27
33	10	27	23	27	13	33	27	23	13.5	3.5
34	3	7	30	30	30	13	30	37	13	7
35	0	3	23.5	23.5	50	7	17	36.5	13	26.5
36	0	7	13	40	40	7	13	33	23.5	23.5
37	0	3	10	30	57	3	17	27	23	30
38	0	0	13	37	50	0	10	43	27	20
39	0	3	20	30	47	0	13	37	23	27
40	3	20	17	17	43	10	30	20	20	20

Table VI-2 : Categorywise percentages of respondents (Assistant Professor) showing existing and expected participation decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System-III						N= 60				
Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1	0	3	17	33	47	15	33.5	28.5	13	10
2	0	2	8	20	70	5	20	42	13	20
3	3	2	12	20	63	2	15	26.5	31.5	25
4	5	13.5	18.5	35	28	33	20	27	12	8
5	3	12	13	30	42	30	20	32	5	13
6	0	6	22	22	50	23	22	25	25	5
7	0	2	2	28	68	7	13	47	23	10
8	0	0	0	32	68	8	15	33.5	25	18.5
9	0	0	0	40	60	17	33	30	15	5
10	0	2	3	27	68	22	27	28	15	8
11	22	18	25	25	10	56.5	25	16.5	0	2
12	12	32	30	18	8	37	43	20	0	0
13	8	36.5	21.5	32	2	30	41.5	20	6.5	2
14	5	47	13	23	12	46.5	31.5	15	5	2
15	3	22	10	30	35	20	28.5	23.5	18	10
16	6.5	6.5	5	30	52	18	20	28.5	13.5	20
17	0	2	3	28	67	22	20	20	23	15
18	0	3	2	28	67	10	18	27	12	33
19	7	13	20	17	43	42	15	23	12	8
20	7	21.5	35	11.5	25	31.5	26.5	25	10	7

contd..

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21	10	38	25	13.5	13.5	27	21.5	31.5	13	7
22	37	33	15	12	3	57	21.5	16.5	5	0
23	25	32	25	13	5	53	27	15	5	0
24	17	35	20	20	8	55	27	15	3	0
25	7	43	13	27	10	38	32	20	2	8
26	8.5	23	18.5	30	20	27	28	20	15	10
27	0	7	13	28	52	10	10	40	20	20
28	5	3	5	27	60	7	17	28	26.5	21.5
29	2	5	15	31.5	46.5	15	17	28	27	13
30	2	15	15	21.5	46.5	20	20	21.5	26.5	12
31	2	2	5	33	58	15	20	18	25	22
32	0	5	5	28	62	17	23	15	17	28
33	7	10	23	22	38	28.5	23.5	23	13	12
34	3	12	26.5	26.5	32	25	22	16.5	21.5	15
35	3	5	17	28	47	7	18	23.5	28.5	23
36	0	7	10	30	53	10	20	15	30	25
37	2	10	10	40	38	12	18	27	18	25
38	2	2	15	35	46	8	17	35	23	17
39	0	5	13	32	50	7	17	43	20	13
40	3	5	8.5	30	53.5	18	13	28.5	28.5	12

Table VI-3 : Categorywise percentages of respondents (Lecturers) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System-III						N=40				
Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1	0	10	22.5	30	37.5	15	30	27.5	20	7.5
2	0	7.5	25	27.5	40	10	17.5	30	30	12.5
3	2.5	12.5	12.5	42.5	30	7.5	10	40	25	17.5
4	2.5	17.5	17.5	32.5	30	15	42.5	20	17.5	5
5	2.5	12.5	10	25	50	17.5	35	30	12.5	5
6	0	2.5	5	50	42.5	17.5	25	40	7.5	10
7	0	2.5	0	45	52.5	7.5	12.5	25	37.5	17.5
8	0	2.5	0	42.5	55	7.5	37.5	27.5	17.5	10
9	0	2.5	2.5	35	60	22.5	25	42.5	2.5	7.5
10	10	10	5	37.5	47.5	15	25	32.5	15	12.5
11	7.5	25	25	20	22.5	35	25	32.5	7.5	0
12	5	25	25	20	25	30	47.5	20	2.5	0
13	2.5	22.5	17.5	37.5	20	20	50	20	75	2.5
14	7.5	25	30	20	17.5	50	22.5	25	2.5	0
15	5	20	20	25	30	32.5	30	17.5	15	5
16	2.5	5	7.5	45	40	25	22.5	20	22.5	10
17	0	5	7.5	42.5	45	10	40	27.5	15	7.5
18	0	5	2.5	47.5	45	10	20	42.5	12.5	15
19	15	12.5	17.5	47.5	7.5	27.5	22.5	37.5	12.5	0
20	10	17.5	20	42.5	10	25	15	25	22.5	12.5

contd...2...

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21	20	35	25	10	10	27.5	37.5	27.5	5	2.5
22	17.5	35	22.5	12.5	12.5	32.5	32.5	25	2.5	7.5
23	20	22.5	15	25	17.5	32.5	40	15	2.5	10
24	15	30	15	15	25	32.5	32.5	25	5	5
25	7.5	10	22.5	37.5	22.5	27.5	20	35	17.5	0
26	0	5	20	47.5	27.5	20	22.5	25	17.5	15
27	2.5	0	12.5	35	50	7.5	30	27.5	22.5	12.5
28	0	2.5	15	42.5	40	10	20	15	25	30
29	0	10	7.5	42.5	40	5	35	15	25	20
30	0	2.5	10	32.5	55	12.5	27.5	22.5	17.5	20
31	0	2.5	5	45	47.5	15	30	17.5	20	17.5
32	2.5	0	5	47.5	45	20	20	12.5	20	27.5
33	2.5	5	10	55	27.5	17.5	35	32.5	7.5	7.5
34	5	7.5	22.5	30	35	22.5	40	17.5	10	10
35	7.5	5	15.5	25	47.5	17.5	27.5	17.5	20	17.5
36	0	7.5	7.5	25	60	7.5	27.5	22.5	25	17.5
37										
38	7.5	7.5	20	32.5	32.5	17.5	30	25	17.5	10
39	5	5	15	45	30	20	30	22.5	20	7.5
40	0	22.5	17.5	22.5	37.5	17.5	30	32.5	17.5	2.5

Table VI-4 : Categorywise percentages of respondents (all faculty) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System-III						N=130				
Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1	1	8.5	21.5	34	35	21	31.5	24.5	14	9
2	1	8.5	20	21.5	49	11.5	26	31	17.5	14
3	5	9	12	31	43	6	14	33	28	19
4	6	21	15	31	27	30	28.5	25	11.5	5
5	4	17	12	28	39	8	29	24.5	30	8.5
6	4	8	17	32	39	27	21	31	16	5
7	0	9	5	35	51	14	19	35	22	10
8	1	5	2	37	55	18	23	30	17.5	11.5
9	1	4.5	4.5	37	53	24	30	33	8.5	4.5
10	1	7	7	34.5	50.5	21	29	29	12.5	8.5
11	20	23	24.5	18.5	14	50	25	22	2	1
12	15	30	26	17	12	37.5	40.5	19	2	1
13	14.5	28.5	18	32	7	27.5	41.5	19	8	4
14	11	33	22	22	12	45	28	18	8	1
15	8	19	14	30	29	24	27	22	18	9
16	8	6	6	35	45	19	19	26	20	16
17	1	5.5	5.5	36	52	15.5	31	22	18.5	13
18	0	4.5	4.5	35	56	10	16	32	14	28
19	11.5	13	21.5	29	25	37	18	26	12	7
20	11.5	21.5	29	20	18	28	25	24	15	8

contd...2...

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21	14.5	33	21.5	17	14	28	25	31	10	6
22	31	32	15	12	10	45	27	19	6	3
23	21	27	20.5	20.5	11	43	32	18	4	3
24	18.5	32	18.5	17	14	46	28.5	18.5	5.5	1.5
25	8	32	17.5	28.5	14	34.5	30.5	24	7	4
26	7	16	19	35.5	22.5	25	27	21.5	15	11
27	2	5	11	31	51	8	15	31	24.5	21.5
28	3	3	9	33	52	7	15	21	28	29
29	1	8	11	35	45	9	19	21	26	25
30	1	7.5	14	27	50.5	15	21	23	25	16
31	1	2	4.5	37.5	55	14.5	23	20	21.5	21
32	1	3	5	35	56	16	24	15	17	28
33	6	12.5	19.5	33	29	26	28	26	11.5	8.5
34	4	9	26	29	32	21.5	29	21.5	16	12
35	4	4.5	17.5	26	48	10	21.	25	22	22
36	0	7	10	31	52	8.5	21	21.5	27	22
37	3	9	9	37	42	9	18.5	28.5	20	24
38	3	3	16	35	43	9	19	34	22.5	15.5
39	2	5	15	35	43	9	20	35	21	15
40	2	14	13	25	46	16	22	28	23	11

Table VI-5 : showing X^2-Values for significance of difference between existing decisional participation and expected decisional participation for each decision situation perceived by the faculty members (respondents) of Education System-III (N=130).

Decision Situation No.	X^2-Value	Decision Situation No.	X^2-Value
1	84.60	21	14.65
2	152.17	22	34.53
3	58.33	23	139.18
4	185.51	24	182.42
5	270.26	25	150.29
6	342.62	26	69.32
7	284.61	27	87.92
8	317.24	28	50.10
9	824.74	29	52.36
10	396.85	30	129.10
11	459.84	31	149.31
12	420.10	32	116.57
13	119.10	33	151.91
14	268.96	34	98.77
15	88.71	35	62.19
16	122.26	36	84.20
17	237.02	37	66.80
18	133.10	38	108.62
19	114.34	39	123.83
20	30.26	40	180.90

Table VI-6 : showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of Professors (N=30)

Measures \ Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	8.27	7.70	8.93	6.60	9.20	8.03	7.07	8.63	8.03	7.30	79.77	61.20	98.40
S.D.	2.63	3.41	3.03	2.95	2.76	3.25	2.67	3.29	2.83	3.46	24.53	26.79	29.00

Table VI-7 : showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of Professors (N=30)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.55	.39	.38	.48	.40	.44	.67	.41	.50	.64	.33	.02
2		1	.66	.79	.42	.69	.55	.70	.73	.82	.87	.44	.39
3			1	.80	.44	.71	.49	.62	.78	.75	.83	.58	.30
4				1	.44	.69	.49	.60	.83	.72	.84	.39	.36
5					1	.59	.47	.62	.39	.48	.66	.32	.38
6						1	.72	.66	.75	.69	.86	.60	.38
7							1	.58	.68	.71	.76	.49	.34
8								1	.60	.67	.84	.52	.15
9									1	.77	.86	.53	.38
10										1	.89	.53	.32
11											1	.59	.38
12												1	.30

Table VI-8 : showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of Assistant Professors (N=60)

Measures \ Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	7.15	8.56	8.98	7.20	8.85	7.37	7.07	8.22	7.43	5.93	76.80	46.55	90.65
S.D.	2.69	2.55	2.59	2.41	3.43	2.61	3.00	2.46	2.58	2.73	17.63	15.37	20.91

Table VI-9 : showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of Assistant Professors (N=60)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.19	.15	.21	.10	.44	.37	.34	.23	.27	.50	.21	-.26
2		1	.37	.36	.27	.42	.25	.29.	.31	.16	.54	.04	-.29
3			1	.32	.36	.51	.41.	.24	.40	.49	.65	.40	-.09
4				1	.15	.37	.62	.58	.13	.33	.61	.10	-.27
5					1	.52	.21	.34	.73	.58	.68	.11	-.15
6						1	.53	.23	.48	.37	.75	.14	-.16
7							1	.39	.26	.49	.70	.30	.00
8								1	.40	.41	.64	.26	-.01
9									1	.67	.71	.22	.02
10										1	.74	.26	-.15
11											1	.30	-.20
12												1	.24
13													1

Table VI-10 : showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of Lecturers (N=40)

Measures \ Variables		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	:	7.13	8.10	8.58	6.85	8.67	8.28	7.65	8.38	8.45	5.58	77.40	46.35	92.39
S.D.	:	3.05	3.64	3.15	3.55	3.98	3.43	3.95	3.21	3.44	3.79	28.26	20.74	24.28

Table VI-11 : showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of Lecturers (N=40)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.56	.70	.54	.48	.64	.22	.62	.69	.69	.76	.13	-.39
2		1	.53	.53	.81	.67	.37	.51	.61	.34	.75	.35	.01
3			1	.80	.57	.78	.54	.72	.85	.79	.90	.19	-.35
4				1	.52	.66	.63	.63	.57	.78	.84	.29	-.21
5					1	.68	.44	.55	.57	.38	.76	.18	-.05
6						1	.57	.66	.76	.65	.89	.30	-.21
7							1	.59	.31	.56	.64	.27	.02
8								1	.54	.72	.81	.31	-.23
9									1	.67	.83	.11	-.43
10										1	.81	.09	-.39
11											1	.29	-.27
12												1	.02
13													1

Table VI-12 : showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of faculty members (combined, N=130).

Measures \ Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	7.40	8.22	8.85	6.95	8.37	7.80	7.25	8.36	7.88	6.14	77.67	49.92	91.81
S.D.	2.84	3.14	2.88	2.94	3.48	3.06	3.27	2.91	2.96	3.32	23.01	21.10	22.74

Table VI-13 : showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of faculty members (N=130).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.39	.40	.37	.32	.50	.31	.52	.44	.50	.63	.25	-.23
2		1	.51	.55	.51	.58	.35	.48	.52	.38	.71	.23	.02
3			1	.63	.46	.65	.47	.52	.65	.66	.79	.37	.08
4				1	.35	.55	.59	.59	.51	.60	.76	.23	-.09
5					1	.59	.34	.47	.59	.46	.69	.19	-.01
6						1	.58	.52	.67	.56	.33	.34	-.03
7							1	.51	.36	.53	.67	.30	.08
8								1	.50	.60	.76	.36	-.04
9									1	.67	.79	.26	-.06
10										1	.80	.32	.11
11											1	.38	-.07
12												1	.18
13													1

Table VI-14 : showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Professors

Education System-III		N=30			df=29	
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-Value
Existing	61.20	26.79	.30	6.181	37.20	6.01
Expected	98.40	29.00				

Table VI-15 : showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Assistant Professors.

Education System-III		N=60			df=59	
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-Value
Existing	46.55	15.37	.24	2.967	44.10	14.82
Expected	90.65	20.91				

Table VI-16 : showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Lecturers

Education System-IV		N=40			df=39	
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Existing	46.35	20.74	.02	5.063	.46	9.85
Expected	92.35	24.28				

Table VI-17 : showing significance of difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Assistant Professors.

Education System-III					df=88	
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Professors	61.20	26.79	30	5.364	14.65	2.73
Assistant Professors	46.55	15.37	60			

Table VI-18 : showing significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers

Education System-III					df=68	
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Professors	61.20	26.79	30	5.983	14.85	2.48
Lecturers	46.35	20.74	40			

Table VI-19 : showing significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Assistant Professors and Lecturers

Education System-III					df=98	
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-Value
Assistant Professor	46.55	15.37	60	3.773	.20	.05
Lecturers	46.35	20.74	40			

Table VI-20 : showing significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Assistant Professors.

Education System-III						df = 88
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Professors	98.40	29.00	30	6.034	7.75	1.28
Assistant Professors	90.65	20.91	60			

Table VI-21 : showing significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers.

Education System-III						df = 68
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Professors	98.40	29.40	30	6.702	6.05	.90
Lecturers	92.35	24.28	40			

Tablve VI-22 : showing significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Assistant Professors and Lecturers

Education System-III						df = 98
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Assistant Professors	90.65	20.91	60	4.746	1.70	.34
Lecturers	92.35	24.28	40			

Table VI-23 : showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of the faculty members

Education System-III		N=130		df=129		
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't'-value
Existing	49.92	21.10	.18	2.474	41.89	16.93
Expected	91.81	22.74				

6.1 GOVERNANCE OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM :

I.I.T. is an autonomous statutory organization functioning within the "Institutes of Technology Act". I.I.T. Council is an apex body established by Government of India to co-ordinate activities of different I.I.T's. The minister incharge of technical education in the Central Government is Chairman of the Council. Other members of the council are : (a) Chairman of each Institute; (b) The Director of each Institute; (c) The Chairman of the University Grant Commission; (d) Director General CSIR; (e) The Chairman of Indian Institute of Science; (f) The Director Indian Institute of Science; (g) Three persons to be nominated by the Central Government; one to represent the Ministry concerned with technical education, another to represent the Ministry of Finance and the third to represent any other Ministry; (h) One person to be nominated by the All India Council of Technical Education; (i) Between three to five members to be

nominated by the visitor who shall be persons having special knowledge or practical experience in respect of education, industry, science or technology; (j) Three members of Parliament of whom two shall be elected by the House of People from among its members and one by the Council of States from among its members. An officer of the Ministry of Central Government concerned with technical education shall be nominated by the Government to act as the Secretary of the Council.

I.I.T. council can advise on matters relating to the direction of the courses, the degrees and other academic distinctions to be conferred by the Institutes, admission standards and other academic matters. It will lay down policy regarding cadres, methods of recruitment and conditions of service of employees, institution of scholarships and freeships, levying of fees and other matters of common interest. It is enpowered to examine the development plans of each Institute and to approve such of them as one considered necessary and also to indicate the financial implications of such plans. It can also examine the annual budget estimates of each Institute and to recommend to the Central Government the allocation of funds for that purpose.

Each Institute of Technology has a Board of Governors responsible for its overall administration and control. Chairman of the Board is nominated by the Visitor. The

Director of the Institute is a ex-officio member. Other members are : (1) One person to be nominated by the Government of each of the states comprising the zone in which the Institute is situated (technologists or industrialists); (2) Four persons having special knowledge or practical experience in respect of education to be nominated by the council (3) Two professors of the Institute to be nominated by the Senate. This board is responsible for the general superintendence, direction and control of the affair of the institute. It may exercise all the powers of the Institute. It has got full power to review the acts of the senate. It may also take decision on questions of policy relating to the administration and working of the institute. Other important, aspects are: (a) To institute courses of study; (b) To make statutes; (c) Consideration and modification of the ordinances or to cancel them; (d) Appointment of staff; (e) To consider and pass resolutions on the annual report, the annual accounts and the budget estimates of the Institute for the next financial year. The board shall have the power to appoint such committees as it considers necessary for the exercise of its powers and the performance of its duties under the act.

There is a Finance Committee to examine and scrutinise the annual budget of the Institute and make recommendations to the Board. It can also give its views and make its recommendations to the Board either on the initiative of

the Board or of the Director, or its own initiative of any financial question affecting the Institute. The Chairman of the Board of Governor is the Chairman of the Committee. Members of the committee are : (i) Director of the Institute; (ii) Two persons nominated by the Central Government (iii) Two persons nominated by the Board.

Construction of all major works and minor repair works is done by Building and Works Committee. It works under the supervision of members (5 to 7) appointed by the Board. It prepares estimates of cost of building and other Capital Works. It is also enpowered for enlistment of suitable contractors and acceptance of tenders.

The Senate of the Institute consist of the following persons: (a) The Director of the Institute who is the Chairman of the Senate; (b) The Deputy Director as ex-officio; (c) All Professors; (d) three persons, not being employees to be nominated by the Chairman in consultation with the Director, from among educationist, of repute, each from fields of science engineering, and humanities; (e) Head of the Department other than the Professors; (f) The Librarian; (g) One Warden by rotation in order of seniority; (h) Workshop Superintendent of the Institute; (i) Not more than six other member of the staff for their special knowledge appointed by the Chairman. The Senate of the Institute has the control and general regulation, and is responsible for the maintenance of standards of instruction education and examination in the

Institute. Activities covered by the Senate are: (a) Curricula; (b) Syllabi; (c) Examination; (d) Review of the activities of the department; (e) Library; (f) Research activity; (g) Halls of Residences; (h) Awards; (i) Stipends; (j) Scholarships. Ordinances made by Senate shall be submitted to Board and Board shall have power by resolution to modify or control any such Ordinances. Ordinances may be regarding courses of study, student admission procedure, awards of fellowships, scholarships, medals, mode of examinations and discipline.

The Institute has a Board of studies to decide academic matters. Dean of Academic courses is also there as a member. Other members are representatives from various departments as per nomination of their respective heads of the departments. Board of studies gets suggestions and proposals from two departmental committees. There is a departmental consultative committee consisting all Professors from the department and other nominated faculty members (Assistant Professors and Lecturers). Head of the department is Chairman of the Committee. One student representative is from graduate courses and another is from post graduate courses. Departmental consultative committee functions in co-ordination with the departmental advisory committee. Departmental advisory committee has got three outside experts as members alongwith the two Professors of the department. Head of the department is the Chairman of this committee. Decision-making about doctoral research work is done by the doctoral committee

which consists of five members (Head of the department, Supervisor or guide, three other members nominated by Head of the Department).

The Director of each Institute is appointed by the Council with the prior approval of the visitor. He is the Principal academic and executive officer of the Institute and is responsible for the proper administration of the Institute and for the imparting of instruction and maintenance of discipline therein.

The Registrar is Secretary of the Board, the Senate and such committees prescribed by the statutes. Any dispute arising out of the contract between an Institute and any of its employees, shall, at the request of the employee concerned or at the instance of the Institute, be referred to a tribunal of Arbitration consisting of one member appointed by the Institute, one member nominated by the employee, and an umpire appointed by the Visitor. The decision of the Tribunal shall be final and shall not be questioned in any court. It shall have powers to regulate its own procedure.

6.2 EXISTING PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING :

Table No.VI-1 reveals the perceived existing decisional participations of the Professors. More than 50% of the Professors perceived less participation (Participation to a less extent or no participation) in decision situations nos. 3,8,9,10,15,16,17,18,21,27,28,29,30,31,32,34,36,37,38,39,40.

From table no.VI-6 it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 61.20, which is less than 80 i.e. mean for the considerable participation.

Table no.VI-2 shows the perceived existing participation of the Assistant Professors in various decision situations. In most of decision situations the participation is less excluding 11,12,13,14,20,21,22,23,24,25. Table no.VI-8 gives the mean of the existing decisional participation 46.55 which is less than the mean for the considerable participation.

Table no.VI-3 gives the picture of existing participation of the Lecturers in various decision situations. In most of decision situations the decisional participation is less excluding 11,12,15,21,22,23,24. From table no.VI-10 it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 46.35 which is less than the mean for the considerable participation.

Table no.VI-4 reveals the perceived existing decisional participation of the faculty members (Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers-all combined). More than 50% of the faculty members perceived less participation in most of the decision situations excluding 11,12,13,14,20,21,22,23,24,25. From table no.VI-12 it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 49.92 which is less than the mean for the considerable participation.

On the basis of above inferences from various tables it could be interpreted that for education system-III (Indian

Institute of Technology) the existing decisional participation of the faculty members is less than the considerable participation.

6.3 EXPECTED PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING :

Table no.VI-1 reveals the perceived expected decisional participation of the Professors. A high percentage of the Professors want good participation (Participation always or participation to a great extent) in various decision situations excluding 3,15,16,21,27,28,29,30,31,32,34,35,36,37,38,39,40. Above 50% of the Professors want less participation (Participation to a less extent or no participation) in decision situation nos.18,27,28,29,30,37. From table no.VI-6 it could be inferred that the mean of the expected decisional participation is 98.40, which is more than 80 i.e. mean for the considerable participation.

Table no.VI-2 shows the perceived expected participation of the Assistant Professors in various decision situations. A high percentage of Assistant Professors want fair participation (Participation always or participation to a great extent or considerable participation) in most of the decision situations excluding 3,35. Table no.VI-8 gives the mean of the expected decisional participation 90.65, which is more than the considerable participation. Table no.VI-3 gives the picture of expected participation of the Lecturers in various decision situations. Above 50% of the Lecturers

want good participation in decision situations nos.4,5, 11,12,13,14,15,21,22,23,24,34. Above 40% of the Lecturers want less participation (Participation to a less extent or no participation) in decision situations nos.3,7,28,29,32. From table no.VI-10 it could be inferred that the mean of the expected participation is 92.35, which is more than the mean for the considerable participation.

Table no.VI-4 reveals the perceived expected decisional participation of the faculty members (Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers -all combined). Most of the faculty members want fair participation (Participation always or participation to a great extent or participation considerably) in various decision situations excluding 28,29. From table no.VI-12, it could be inferred that the mean of the expected decisional participation is 91.81 which is more than the mean for the considerable participation.

It good could be interpreted that faculty members want fair participation in various decision situations.

6.4 DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EXISTING AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

Table no.VI-14 shows the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Professors. Calculated 't'-value is 6.01, which is clearly significant .01 level of confidence (From t-table, for df=29, 't' is 2.76 for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean

is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table VI-15 gives the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Assistant Professors. Calculated 't'-value is 14.82, which is highly significant at .01 level of confidence (From t-table for df=50, 't' is 2.68, for df=60, 't' is 2.66, for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the epxected decisional participation mean is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table no.VI-16 shows the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Lecturers. Calculated 't'-value is 9.85, which is clearly significant at .01 level of confidence. (From t-table, for df=35, 't' is 2.72 for df=40, 't' is 2.71 for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean of is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table no.VI-17, reveals the significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Assistant Professors. Calculated 't'-value is 2.73 which is significant at .01 level (from t-table for df=80, 't' is 2.64, for df=90, 't' is 2.63). It could be interpreted that the existing decisional participation mean of the Professors is higher than the existing decisional participation mean of the Assistant Professors.

Table no.VI-18 shows the significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers. Calculated 't'-value is 2.48 which is significant at .05 level of confidence (from t-table, for df=60, 't' is 2.00, for df=70, 't' is 2.00, for .05 level). It could be interpreted that the existing decisional participation mean of the Professors is higher than the existing decisional participation mean of the Lecturers (at .05 level of confidence).

Table no.VI-19 gives the significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Assistant Professors and Lecturers. Calculated 't'-value is .05, which is clearly insignificant at .05 level (From t-table, for df=90, 't'-value is 1.99, for df=100, 't' is 1.98, for .05 level). It could be interpreted that the existing decisional participation mean of the Assistant Professors differs insignificantly, than the existing decisional participation of the Lecturers.

Table no.VI-20 shows the significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Assistant Professors. Calculated 't'-value is 1.28 which is insignificant at .05 level of confidence (From t-table for df=80, 't'-value is 1.99, for d=90, 't'-value is 1.99 for .05 level). It could be interpreted that there exists insignificant difference of means between Professors and Assistant Professors.

Table No.VI-21 gives the significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers. Calculated 't'-value is .90 which is insignificant at .05 level (For df=60, 't'-value is 2.00, for df=70, 't'-value is 1.99, for .05 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation means of the Professors and Lecturers have got insignificant difference.

Table No.VI-22 shows the significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Assistant Professors and Lecturers. Calculated 't'-value is .34, which is insignificant at .05 level. (From 't'-value, for df=90, 't'-value is 1.99, for df=100, 't'-value is 1.98, for .05 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean of the Assistant Professors has got insignificant difference with the expected decisional participation of the Lecturers.

Table-No.VI-23 gives the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of the faculty members (Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers - all combined). Calculated 't'-value is 16.93, which is highly significant at .01 level (From 't'-table for df=125, 't'-value is 2.62, for df=150, 't'-value is 2.61, for .01 level). It could be interpreted that there is a significant difference between existing and expected decisional participation of the faculty members. Expected decisional participation mean is

higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

6.5 ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM-III :

Table no.VI-6 gives the mean score of the organizational health as 79.77 based on perceptions of thirty Professors. Table no.VI-8 gives the mean score of the organizational health as 76.80 based on perceptions of sixty Assistant Professors.Table no.VI-10 gives the mean score of the organizational health as 77.40 based on perceptions of forty Lecturers. Table no.VI-12 shows the mean score of the organizational health as 77.67 based on perceptions of one thirty faculty members (Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers - all combined). It could be inferred that the mean scores of organizational health perceived by Professors, Assistant Professors and Lecturers are in the range of 75 to 80. Average organizational health, based on the forty, items, could be taken as 80 (40x2). Here it could be interpreted that organizational health of the Education System-III could be taken as somewhat less than the average organizational health.

Table no.VI-5 shows the chi-square (X^2) values for finding the significance of the difference between existing decisional participation and expected decisional participation for each decision situation perceived by the faculty members (Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers - all combined) for the Education System-III. For df=4, the Chi-square value is 13.277 from the standard Chi-square table. It could

be inferred from the table no.VI-5 that all the values of Chi-square for forty decision situations are higher than the standard value from the chi-square table. It could be interpreted that there is a significant difference between the existing decisional participation and expected decisional participation of the faculty members for various decision situations.

6.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

,Relationship between organizational health and existing decisional participation could be found out on the basis of the correlation co-efficient calculated from the organizational health score and existing decisional participation score (table nos.VI-7, VI-9, VI-11, VI-13). Table no.VI-7 gives r = .59 which is significant correlation at .01 level (From the standard table, for df=28, r =.463, for .01 level). From table no.VI-9 shows r =.30 which is significant at .05 level (from the standard table, for df=50, r =.273 or .354 for .05 level and .01 level respectively; for df=60, r=.250 or .325 for .05 and .01 level respectively). From table no.VI-11 it could be seen that r =.29, which is insignificant at .05 level (From the standard table, for df=35, r =.325, for df=40, r =.304, for .05 level). Table no.VI-13 gives r=.38 which shows significant co-rrelation (From the standard table, for df=125, 't' is .228, for df=150, df=.208). From the basis of the above inferences it could be interpreted that there is a correlation between organizational

health and existing decisional participation.

6.7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

Relationship between organizational health and expected decisional participation could be found out on the basis of the correlation co-efficient calculated from the organizational health score and expected decisional participation score (table nos. VI-7, VI-9, VI-11, VI-13). Only table no.VI-7 gives significant value of correlation (r=.38 which is significant at .05 level as from standard table for df=28, r =.361 for .05 level of confidence). Values of r in other tables are very low. It could be interpreted that there is a correlation between organizational health and expected decisional participation (based on the Lecturers' perception). In the case of Professors and Assistant Professors relationship is not significant.

6.8 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXISTING DECIAIONAL PARTICIPATION AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

From table no.VI-7 it could be inferred that r =.30 which is insignificant at .05 level (From the standard table for df=28, r =.361 at .05 level). From table no.VI-9, it can be observed that r=.24 which is insignificant at .05 level (From the standard table for df=50, r =.273, for df =60, r =.250 for .05 level). From table no.VI-11 it can be seen that r =.02 which is very low or negligible correlation. From table no.VI-13 it could be observed that r =.18 which is significant at .05 level

(from the standard table for df=125, r = .174 and for df = 150, r = .159).

From the above inferences, it could be interpreted that there is a slight relationship between existing and expected decisional participation.