The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) Volume 4, Issue 3, DIP: 18.01.103/20170403 DOI:10.25215/0403.103 http://www.ijip.in | April - June, 2017



**Original Research Paper** 

# **Opinion of Educational Functionaries towards the Functioning of**

# Rajiv Vidya Mission (SSA)

G. Jagan Mohan<sup>1</sup>\*

# ABSTRACT

SSA is an Indian programme aimed at the universalization of elementary education in a time bound manner, as mandated by the 86th amendment to the constitution of India making free and compulsory education to children between the ages of 6 to 14 a fundamental right. The Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan realizes that untills now focus has been more on Access to primary education and increase in enrolment and Retention of children in schools with somewhat inadequate attention to quality of education in terms of effective teaching and adequate level of student's achievement. The Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan now, while recognizing the need for increasing Access, enrolment and Retention lays stress on improving the quality of education. It therefore proposes a holistic and comprehensive approach to the issue of quality. It encourages decentralization and vibrant role of community in the school management and implementation of interventions. It is implied that planning and interventions and their implementation. Focusing on improvement of quality in elementary education, must go hand in hand with the effort to increase enrolment and Retention (T.N. Dhar, et.al., 2004). This study focuses on the opinion of educational functionaries towards the functioning of Rajiv Vidya Mission.

Keywords: Educational functionaries, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, Rajiv Vidya Mission.

**R**ajiv Vidya Mission (RVM/SSA) is an effort to universalize elementary education by 2010 through community ownership. A number of effective studies on the base line assessment about current situation with regard to learning achievement, retention, access, gender, equity, social equity, physical infrastructure etc., were undertaken as preparatory activities. Therefore considering the importance of the learning achievement, retention, access, gender, equity, social equity, physical infrastructure etc. there is a need to understand the opinion of educational functionaries towards the functioning of rajiv vidya mission and the association of variables, the present study is undertaken and although innumerable studies are conducted on rajiv vidya

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ph.D Research Scholar, Faculty of Education, Osmania University, Hyderabad, India <u>\*Responding Author</u>

Received: May 17, 2017; Revision Received: May 31, 2017; Accepted: June 20, 2017

<sup>© 2017</sup> Mohan J; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

mission(SSA). The results of the study would be of immense useful to bring changes in the school education. Hence the researcher wants to study the -Opinion of Educational Functionaries towards the Functioning of Rajiv Vidya Mission (SSA) in Warangal District of Andhra Pradesh.

# **Objectives**

• To study the opinions of the Educational Functionaries with respect to their designation towards the RVM (SSA) with regard to access enrollment, retention and quality provided to the children at primary level.

# **Hypothesis**

- 1. There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their designation towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to access.
- 2. There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their designation towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to enrollment.
- 3. There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their designation towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to retention.
- 4. There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their designation towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to quality.

# **Population & Sample**

The population of the study consists of all the Teachers and Head Masters at elementary level and all Educational Officials of Warangal District of Andhra Pradesh state. Total 380 Respondents were selected for the present study including PS/UPS Teachers and Head masters. 219 respondents are PS/UPS teachers and head masters remaining 161 respondents are educational official's viz., School Complex Head Masters, Cluster Resource Persons, RVM Sectoral and Asst. Sectoral Officers, MEOs, Dy. E.Os, KGBV Special Officers, Divisional level team members etc., constituted the universe of the study. The total sample of the study was 760.

### Tools

Tools used in the present study are as follows.

- 1. Opinions of educational functionaries questionnaire developed by the investigator
- 2. Interview questionnaire about RVM (SSA) developed by the investigator

Interventions	Percentage	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Access	85.99%	380	6	17	12.90	1.980	3.921
Enrollment	82.90%	380	18	33	27.36	3.288	10.812
Retention	82.69%	380	19	33	27.29	3.198	10.227
Quality	81.32%	380	51	109	80.51	9.508	90.398

# Analysis of Data

Table 1 Shows the percentage of agreement regarding ACCESS, ENROLLMENT, RETENTION AND QUALITY wise Percentage, 'Mean' and S.D values of the of the respondents:

It is evident from the table 1 that,

- i. The percentage of agreement of the Respondents with regard to Access is 85.99%, which indicates majority of the Respondents agree.
- ii. The percentage of agreement of the Respondents with regard to Enrollment is 82.90%, which indicates majority of the Respondents agree.
- iii. The percentage of agreement of the Respondents with regard to Retention is 82.69%, which indicates majority of the Respondents agree.
- iv. The percentage of agreement of the Respondents with regard to Quality is 81.32%, which indicates majority of the Respondents agree.

Table 2 Shows the Designation wise 'Mean' and SD values of the opinions of the respondents.

RVM functioning areas	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
4 2 2 2 2 2	Edu.Official	161	13.11	1.948	.154
Access	Teacher	219	12.75	1.994	.135
	Edu.Official	161	27.23	3.410	.269
Enrollment	Teacher	219	27.46	3.200	.216
Retention	Edu.Official	161	27.42	3.267	.257
Kelenlion	Teacher	219	27.19	3.151	.213
Quality	Edu.Official	161	77.50	9.677	.763
Quanty	Teacher	219	82.72	8.767	.592

It is evident from the table 2 that,

- i. The mean and SD values of **Educational officials** regarding **Access** are 13.11 and 1.948, **Enrollment** are 27.23 and 3.410, **Retention** 27.42 and 3.267 and **Quality** 77.50 and 9.677
- ii. The mean and SD values of **Teachers** regarding Access are 12.75 and 1.994, Enrollment are 27.46and 3.200, Retention 27.19 and 3.151and Quality 82.72 and 8.767

Table 3 Shows the Designation wise t- values of the opinions of the respondents

RVM functioning areas		t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	
Access	Equal variances assumed	1.740	378	.083	.357	
	Equal variances not assumed	1.746	349.34	.092	.357	
Enrolment	Equal variances assumed	664	378	.507	227	
	Equal variances not assumed	658	332.07	.511	227	
Retention	Equal variances assumed	.694	378	.488	.231	
	Equal variances not assumed	.690	337.74	.491	.231	
Quality	Equal variances assumed	-5.481	378	.204	-5.214	
	Equal variances not assumed	-5.399	324.61	.107	-5.214	

© The International Journal of Indian Psychology, ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) | 24

It is evident from the table 3 that, t- test was employed to find out the mean score differences between the Educational Functionaries with respect to their **Designation** (Teachers and educational Officials)

# Testing of Hypothesis-1

There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their **Designation** towards the RVM(SSA) activities with regard to **Access**.

From table 3 the calculated t-Value 1.740 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated null Hypothesis-1 is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between Educational Officials and Teachers in their opinion with regard to **Access**.

# Testing of Hypothesis-2

There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their **Designation** towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to **Enrolment.** 

From table 3 the calculated t-Value .664 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated null Hypothesis-2 is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between Educational Officials and Teachers in their opinion with regard to **Enrolment**.

# Testing of Hypothesis-3

There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their **Designation** towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to **Retention**.

From table 3 the calculated t-Value .694 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated null Hypothesis-3 is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between Educational Officials and Teachers in their opinion with regard to **Retention**.

# Testing of Hypothesis-4

There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their **Designation** towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to **Quality**.

From table 3 the calculated t-Value 5.481 is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence the formulated null Hypothesis-4 is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between Educational Officials and Teachers in their opinion with regard to **Quality**.

# FINDINGS

There is no significant difference in the opinion of Educational Functionaries with respect to their designation towards the RVM (SSA) activities with regard to access, enrolment, retention and quality.

#### Acknowledgments

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interests: The author declared no conflict of interests.

#### REFERENCES

- Agarwal, J.C. (2001). *Modern Indian Education* (History, Development and problems). New Delhi: Shipra Publications. p.31, Pp.40-41.
- Agarwal, J.C. (2002). *Philosophical and Sociological Perspectives on Education*. New Delhi: Shipra Publications.
- Bhaskar Rao, Digumarthi (Ed). (1998). District Primary Education programme. New Delhi: *Discovery Publishing House*.
- Bhatia,K.K.(2003). Foundations of Education. Ludhiana: Kalyani Publications.
- Dayakar Babu.K.A.S.(March, 2013). A study on the impact of Rajiv vidya mission programme for quality education in primary schools of krishna district in andhra pradesh state. Visakhapatnam.
- Dhawan. M. L.(Ed).(2007) Education of children's with Special needs. Delhi: ISHA Books, pp.298-299.
- Govinda Rao, L(Ed). (2007). Perspectives on Special Education. Vol.1 Hyderabad: *Neel kamal Publications Private Limited*. Pp.24-27.
- Mehta, Arun.C. (2007). *Elementary Education in India: Progress towards UEE*, Analytical Report/Tables for the year 2007-08. Source: Internet.
- Panigrahi, Manas Ranjan. (2008). Quality Elementary Education: Researches and Issues. New Delhi: *Mahamaya Publishing House*. p.62&73, p.172,pp.183-184,pp.245-255.
- Raghavendra, P.S., Narayana, K.S. (2004). Problems and Prospects of Elementary Education and Literacy in India, *Perspectives in Education*.

**How to cite this article:** Mohan J (2017), Opinion of Educational Functionaries towards the Functioning of Rajiv Vidya Mission (SSA), *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, (3), DIP:18.01.103/20170403, DOI:10.25215/0403.103