



PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATORS IN SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND DISTRICT INSTITUTES OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN NAGALAND

DR. BENDANGYAPANGLA

Associate Professor
State College of Teacher Education, Kohima
(NAGALAND) INDIA

ABSTRACT

The study tried to find out the commitment of teacher educators towards their profession in relation to educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and level of teacher education. Hypotheses were formulated according to the objectives identified. Descriptive research method was adopted for the study and population consisted of the teacher educators placed in the Secondary Teacher Education Institutions (STEI) and District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET) in Nagaland. Professional Commitment Scale for Teacher Educators, developed by Dr. Vishal Sood was employed for collection of data; Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated and t-test along with one-way ANOVA were applied to compare the professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to five dimensions. Analysis of data showed that place of residence, teaching experience made no difference in professional commitment; male teacher educators, and teacher educators in Secondary Teacher Education Institutions were more committed; however, educational qualification affected certain aspects of their commitment.

Key words: *Teacher Educators, Professional Commitment, Educational Qualification, Teaching Experience, Location of Residence, Gender, STEI, DIET*

DR. BENDANGYAPANGLA

1Page



INTRODUCTION:

In any profession commitment of an individual is of utmost importance. The success of the institution depends on the priorities apportioned by the individual to it. Every educational institution has a vision and objectives that it aspires to fulfil. However, in the absence of committed human resources such aspirations are bound to remain unfulfilled. Professional commitment is defined as loyalty, the desire to stay in a profession, and a sense of responsibility toward the profession's particular problems and challenges (Fateme Jafaraghaee, et al). According to Aranya & Ferris, Professional Commitment is an individual's relative strength to identify with and involve in one's profession; it is the acceptance of its goals and willingness to exert effort on behalf of that profession. (Faiyaz Ahammad, pp 613). Therefore, Professional Commitment in the teaching profession is about being able to dedicate oneself to achieve the goals and ethics of the profession. It is the willingness to devote one's strength towards the efforts of surrendering the self for the greater good of the profession one has chosen.

The Mudaliar Commission in its report (pp130) stated, "We are, however, convinced that the most important factor in the contemplated educational reconstruction is the teacher-his personal qualities, his educational qualifications, his professional training and the place that he occupies in the school as well as in the community". Refraining the report of the National Policy on Education, 1986, the Secondary Education Commission, 1964-66 (pp xiii) affirms that "of all factors which determine the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the teacher is undoubtedly the most important. It is on his personal qualities and character, his educational qualifications and professional competence that the success of all educational endeavour must ultimately depend". The NCFTE 2010 very rightly declares that teachers are crucial mediating agents who are responsible for transaction of the curriculum in such a way that knowledge is co-constructed along with the learners, and that the curriculum is to be enriched by making it less textbook-centred. It, further states, "A teacher needs to be prepared in relation to the needs and demands arising in the school context, to engage with questions of school knowledge, the learner and the learning process. The expectations of the school system from a teacher change from time to time, responding to the broader social, economic and political changes taking place in the society" (pp2). In asserting its vision for Teacher Education the NCF, 2005 has called for teacher education to be more 'sensitive to the emerging demands from the school system'. It has envisioned the role of teachers as being encouraging, supportive and humane facilitator through which the learners will be able to discover their talents, realise their physical and intellectual potentialities to the fullest, and to develop character and desirable social and human values to function as responsible citizens (pp 107).



Need and Significance

The onus of preparing the teachers for bearing the burden of the aspirations of the nation, undoubtedly, falls on the teacher educators and, therefore, it is imperative that the latter are committed to their profession. The teacher educator has the most important responsibility of guiding the future teachers to be effective and efficient facilitators of the budding young. His/her job as a transactor of the curriculum is not as crucial as their leadership qualities, values, diligence, personal and work ethics, professional growth and commitment. Besides engaging the student-teachers in theory courses, the responsibilities of the teacher educator are manifold. The student-teachers will have to be prepared for field based activities, activity and participatory-based learning and teaching, become reflective practitioners and reflective thinkers. Further, it is important to instil in them a sense of responsibility towards the community and “live in harmony within oneself and with natural and social environment; promote peace, democratic way of life, constitutional values of equality, justice, liberty, fraternity and secularism, and caring values” (NCFTE 2010, pp 21). The ability, potential, capability of a teacher educator determines the achievement of all these vision. A teacher education programme cannot succeed in the absence of teacher educators who are wholly committed to their profession. The decision makers are obligated to the society to make policies that are favourable for the progress of teacher education. Therefore, a study that would lead to the discovery of the extent of dedication of teacher educators towards their profession was necessary.

Objectives

1. To find out the commitment of teacher educators towards their profession
2. To compare the commitment of teacher educators towards their profession in relation to educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender, marital status and level of teacher education

Hypotheses

H01 - There is no significant difference between professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Learner on the basis of educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and level of teacher education

H02 - There is no significant difference between professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Society on the basis of educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and level of teacher education



H03 - There is no significant difference between professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Profession on the basis of educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and level of teacher education

H04 - There is no significant difference between professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions on the basis of educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and level of teacher education

H05 - There is no significant difference between professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Basic Values on the basis of educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and level of teacher education

Method

Descriptive research method was adopted for the study

Population and Sample

The population consisted of the teacher educators placed in the Secondary Teacher Education Institutions (STEI) and District Institutes of Education and Training (DIET) in Nagaland. Random sampling technique was applied to select ninety teacher educators from five STEIs and three DIETs. However, responses were returned only by eighty five respondents.

Tool

Professional Commitment Scale for Teacher Educators, developed by Dr. Vishal Sood was employed for collection of the data. It consisted of seventy items with five dimensions.

Analysis and Interpretation

Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated and t-test along with one-way ANOVA applied to compare the professional commitment of teacher educators with respect to the five dimensions of commitment to the learner, commitment to the society, commitment to the profession, commitment to achieve excellence for professional actions and commitment to basic values vis-à-vis their educational qualification, teaching experience, location of residence, gender and institution.

DR. BENDANGYAPANGLA

4P a g e

Table-1: Professional Commitment of Teacher Educators as per location of residence

Dimensions	Location of Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t-value
Commitment to the Learner	Rural	29	56.76	5.249	.975	0.589 *
	Urban	56	57.41	4.615	.617	
Commitment to the Society	Rural	29	48.10	8.104	1.505	1.411 *
	Urban	56	45.38	8.620	1.152	
Commitment to the Profession	Rural	29	57.38	5.137	.954	1.371 *
	Urban	56	55.98	4.061	.543	
Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions	Rural	29	57.90	6.275	1.165	1.459 *
	Urban	56	55.73	6.591	.881	
Commitment to Basic Values	Rural	29	51.45	5.841	1.085	1.320 *
	Urban	56	49.75	5.508	.736	
Total Score	Rural	29	271.59	25.812	4.793	1.256 *
	Urban	56	264.25	25.375	3.391	

*Not significant at 0.05 level of significance

From the above table 1 it can be deduced that the mean score and SD of Commitment to the Learner of rural teacher educators was 56.76 and 5.249 and of the urban was 57.41 and 4.615. The calculated t- value, 0.589, for the significance of the difference between the means of rural and urban teacher educators on Commitment to the Learner was less than table value (1.98) for df=83 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of teacher educators residing in rural and urban with respect to dimension commitment to the learner was accepted.

With regard to the dimension of Commitment to Society the mean score and SD of Professional Commitment of rural teacher educators were 48.10 and 8.104 and of the urban was 45.38 and 8.620. The calculated t value, 1.411, for the significance of the difference between the means of rural and urban teacher educators on Commitment to Society was less than table value (1.98) for df=83 at 0.05 level of significance and so the null hypothesis that

DR. BENDANGYAPANGLA

5P age

there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of rural and urban teacher educators with respect to the dimension Commitment towards Society was accepted. The mean score and SD of Commitment to the Profession of rural teacher educators showed 57.38 and 5.137 and of the urban showed 55.98 and 4.061. The calculated t value, 1.371, for the significance of the difference between the means of rural and urban teacher educators on Commitment to the Profession is less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of rural and urban teacher educators with respect to the dimension Commitment to the Profession could not be rejected.

It is, again, seen that the mean score and SD of Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions of rural teacher educators were 57.90 and 6.275 and of the urban was 55.73 and 6.591. The calculated t- value, 1.459, for the significance of the difference between the means of rural and urban teacher educators on Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions was less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance, which brought to acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of rural and urban teacher educators with respect to the dimension Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions.

The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Commitment to Basic Values of rural and urban teacher educators with respect to commitment to basic values could not be rejected since the mean score and SD of Commitment to Basic Values of rural teacher educators were 51.45 and 5,841 and of the urban 49.75 and 5.508. The calculated t-value, 1.320, for the significance of the difference between the means of rural and urban teacher educators on the dimension Commitment to Basic Values was less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance.

The overall mean score and SD of Professional Commitment of rural teacher educators was 271.59 and 25.812 and of the urban was 264.25 and 25.375. The calculated t-value 1.256 for the significance of the difference between the mean scores of rural and urban teacher educators on Professional Commitment was less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis 'there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of teacher educators residing in rural and urban locality was not rejected.

Table 2: Professional Commitment of Male and Female Teacher Educators

Dimensions	Sex	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	t-value
Commitment to the Learner	Male	27	58.56	6.034	1.161	1.809*

	Female	58	56.55	4.040	.530	
Commitment to the Society	Male	27	50.74	9.975	1.920	3.494
	Female	58	44.24	6.886	.904	
Commitment to the Profession	Male	27	56.63	5.858	1.127	0.239*
	Female	58	56.38	3.722	.489	
Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions	Male	27	58.81	7.442	1.432	2.316
	Female	58	55.38	5.809	.763	
Commitment to Basic Values	Male	27	50.96	6.167	1.187	0.704*
	Female	58	50.03	5.419	.712	
Total Score	Male	27	275.70	31.936	6.146	2.251
	Female	58	262.59	21.114	2.772	

*At 0.05 level of significance

Table 2 shows that the mean score and SD of Commitment to the Learner of male teacher educators as being 58.56 and 6.034 and of the female as 56.55 and 4.040. The calculated t value, 1.809, for the significance of the difference between the means of male and female teacher educators on Commitment to Learner was less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of male and female teacher educators with respect to dimension commitment to the learner was accepted.

The mean score and SD of Commitment to the Society of male teacher educators were 50.74 and 9.975 and of the female were 44.24 and 6.886. The calculated t value, 3.494, for the significance of the difference between the means of male and female teacher educators on Commitment to the Society was more than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of male and female teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Society was rejected. The mean score indicated that Professional Commitment of male teacher educators with respect to Society was better than female teacher educators.

Further, the mean score and SD of Commitment to the Profession of male teacher educators were 56.63 and 5.858 and of the female were 56.38 and 3.722. The calculated t value, 0.239, for the significance of the difference between the means of male and female teacher educators on Commitment to the Profession was less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of male and female teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Profession was accepted.

With regard to the mean score and SD of Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions of male and female teacher educators were 58.81 and 7.442, and 55.38 and 5.809 respectively. The calculated t value, 2.316, for the significance of the difference between the means of male and female teacher educators on Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions was more than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of male and female teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions was rejected. The Mean Score showed that male teacher educators are more committed than female teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions.

Again, the mean score and SD of Commitment to Basic Values of male and female teacher educators was 50.96 and 6.167 and 50.03 and 5.419 respectively. The calculated t value, 0.704, for the significance of the difference between the means of male and female teacher educators on Commitment to Basic Values was found to be less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of male and female teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Basic Values could not be rejected, hence, accepted.

The table, also, shows that the overall mean score and SD of Professional Commitment of male teacher educators was 275.70 and 31.936 and of female was 262.59 and 21.114. The calculated t-value 2.251 for the significance of the difference between the mean scores of male and female teacher educators on Professional Commitment was more than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis 'there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of male and female teacher educators was rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between male and female teacher educators in Professional Commitment. The Mean Score showed that Male teacher educators are more committed to their profession than female teacher educators.

Table 3(a): Mean and SD of Professional Commitment as per qualification

Qualification	N	Mean	SD
PG, BEd	47	263.38	26.941
PG, MEd	25	259.96	15.140
PG, BEd, PhD	8	299.75	26.310
PG, M.Ed, PhD	5	279.60	5.941
Total	85	266.75	25.611

Table 3 (b): Result of F-test for the significant difference among different qualification level of teacher educators in Professional Commitment

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	S/NS
Commitment to the Learner	Between Groups	320.071	3	106.690	5.299	S*
	Within Groups	1630.917	81	20.135		
	Total	1950.988	84			
Commitment to the Society	Between Groups	1609.996	3	536.665	9.751	S*
	Within Groups	4458.051	81	55.038		
	Total	6068.047	84			
Commitment to the Profession	Between Groups	67.684	3	22.561	1.131	NS*
	Within Groups	1615.421	81	19.943		
	Total	1683.106	84			
Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions	Between Groups	635.419	3	211.806	5.824	S*
	Within Groups	2945.757	81	36.367		
	Total	3581.176	84			
Commitment to Basic Values	Between Groups	359.747	3	119.916	4.188	S*
	Within Groups	2319.030	81	28.630		
	Total	2678.776	84			
Total Score	Between Groups	11223.045	3	3741.015	6.907	NS*
	Within Groups	43874.766	81	541.664		
	Total	55097.812	84			

*At 0.05 level of significance

Table 3 (b) shows that the calculated value of F (5.299) for $df=3$ and 81 is more than the critical F value (2.717) and therefore statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their qualification on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Learner was rejected.

The calculated value of F (9.731) for $df=3$ and 81 was more than the critical F value (2.717) and was therefore statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance for the dimension Commitment to the Society. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference

among the means of different groups on the basis of their qualification on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Society was rejected.

For dimension three the calculated value of F (1.131) for $df=3$ and 81 was less than the critical F value (2.717) and was therefore not statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their qualification on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Profession was not rejected and therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions had calculated value of F (5.824) for $df=3$ and 81 was more than the critical F value (2.717) and therefore statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their qualification on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions was rejected.

Moreover, the calculated value of F (4.188) for $df=3$ and 81 was more than the critical F value (2.717) and therefore statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their qualification on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to Basic Values was rejected.

Table 4 (a): Mean and SD of Professional Commitment as per teaching years

Length of teaching	N	Mean	SD
(0 – 5yrs)	23	268.70	22.961
(6 – 10yrs)	38	261.84	24.651
(11- 15 yrs)	11	270.27	22.141
(16 – 20 yrs)	7	283.86	38.809
(21+ yrs)	6	264.00	27.727
Total	85	266.75	25.611

Table 4 (b): Result of F-test for the significant difference among teacher educators in Professional Commitment with respect to length of teaching

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	S/N S
Commitment to the Learner	Between Groups	200.328	4	50.082	2.289	NS*
	Within Groups	1750.661	80	21.883		
	Total	1950.988				

Commitment to the Society	Between Groups	310.756	4	77.689	1.080	NS*
	Within Groups	5757.292	80	71.966		
	Total	6068.047				
Commitment to the Profession	Between Groups	67.617	4	16.904	0.837	NS*
	Within Groups	1615.489	80	20.194		
	Total	1683.106				
Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions	Between Groups	180.934	4	45.234	1.064	NS*
	Within Groups	3400.242	80	42.503		
	Total	3581.176				
Commitment to Basic Values	Between Groups	90.818	4	22.705	0.702	NS*
	Within Groups	2587.958	80	32.349		
	Total	2678.776				

**At 0.05 level of significance*

Table 4 (b) shows that, the computed f-value was found to be 2.289 for $df=4$ and 80 which was less than the critical f-value (2.485) and was therefore statistically not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their years of teaching experience on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Learner was accepted.

Further, the computed f-value was found to be 1.080 for $df=4$ and 80 which was less than the critical f-value (2.485) and was therefore statistically not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their years of teaching experience on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Society could not be rejected.

With regard to the years of teaching experience on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Profession the computed f-value was found to be 0.837 for $df=4$ and 80 which was less than the critical f-value (2.485) and therefore statistically not significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their years of teaching experience on Professional Commitment with respect to Commitment to the Profession could not be rejected.

Similarly, the computed f-value 1.064 for $df=4$ and 80 was less than the critical f-value (2.485) and therefore statistically not significant at 0.05 level of significance for Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions and the computed f-value for Commitment to Basic Values which was found to be 2.289 for $df=4$ and 80 and less than the critical f-value (2.485) and therefore statistically not significant at 0.05 level of significance the null

hypothesis that there is no significant difference among the means of different groups on the basis of their years of teaching experience on Professional Commitment was accepted.

Table 5: Result of the t-test showing Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET Teacher Educators

Dimension	Institute	N	Mean	SD	df	t	S/NS
Commitment to the Learner	STEI	42	57.81	5.018	83	1.177	NS*
	DIET	43	56.58	4.594			
Commitment to the Society	STEI	42	47.52	8.443	83	1.311	NS*
	DIET	43	45.12	8.483			
Commitment to the Profession	STEI	42	56.26	3.858	83	0.399	NS*
	DIET	43	56.65	5.047			
Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions	STEI	42	57.17	6.393	83	0.971	NS*
	DIET	43	55.79	6.664			
Commitment to Basic Values	STEI	42	51.88	4.329	83	2.587	S*
	DIET	43	48.81	6.382			

*At 0.05 level of significance

As seen in table 5 it was revealed that the mean score and SD of Professional Commitment STEI teacher educators was 57.81 and 5.018 and that of the DIET as 56.58 and 4.594. The calculated t value, 1.177 for the significance of the difference between the means of STEI and DIET teacher educators on Professional Commitment was less than table value (1.98) for df=83 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Learner could not be rejected and the null hypothesis accepted. Further, the mean score and SD of Professional Commitment STEI teacher educators were 47.52 and 8.443 and of the DIET 45.12 and 8.483. The calculated t value, 1.311 for the significance of the difference between the means of CTE and DIET teacher educators on Professional Commitment was less than table value (1.98) for df=83 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Society was accepted.

Dimension, Commitment to the Profession, shows the mean score and SD of Professional Commitment STEI teacher educators was 56.26 and 3.858 and of the DIET was 56.65 and 5.047. The calculated t value, 0.399 for the significance of the difference between the means of STEI and DIET teacher educators on Professional Commitment was less than table value



(1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators with respect to Commitment to the Profession cannot be rejected. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Where dimension four was concerned the mean score and SD of Professional Commitment STEI teacher educators was 57.17 and 6.393 and that of the DIET were 55.79 and 6.664. The calculated t value, 0.971 for the significance of the difference between the means of STEI and DIET teacher educators on Professional Commitment was less than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions was accepted.

The mean score and SD of Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators were 51.88 and 4.329, and 48.81 and 6.382 respectively for dimension five. The calculated t value, 2.587 for the significance of the difference between the means of STEI and DIET teacher educators on Professional Commitment was more than table value (1.98) for $df=83$ at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators with respect to Commitment to Basic Values was rejected. The Mean Score also indicated that STEI teacher educators are more committed than DIET teacher educators with respect to Basic Values in Professional Commitment.

FINDINGS

- Professional Commitment of teacher educators residing in both rural and urban places was found to be at par.
- Male and female teacher educators had similar Commitment to the learner, to the Profession and to Basic Values. However, male teacher educators were found to be more committed to their profession than female teacher educators.
- Commitment towards the Learner, to the Society, to Achieve Excellence for Professional Actions and to Basic Values was affected by the educational qualification of the teacher educators. However, Commitment to the Profession remained the same.
- The teacher educators' years of Teaching Experience had no difference on their Professional Commitment with regard to the different dimensions as mentioned.
- Professional Commitment of STEI and DIET teacher educators differed with respect to Commitment to Basic Values. The former were more committed than the latter.

CONCLUSION

DR. BENDANGYAPANGLA

13 Page



Professional commitment of teacher educators is of utmost importance as one's commitment or lack of it affects the whole of education system. Their dedication to the service that they profess, their efficacy and efficiency, their knowledge and the way content is transacted, their attitude and personality, in fact, every aspect of their life impacts the student-teachers' learning. The study brought to light the existence of certain disparities within the teacher education fraternity with regard to commitment towards their profession. Such problems could be the creation of the individual or may also lie with the policies regulating the institution of teacher education. Therefore, the decision makers may need to rethink on existing policies vis-à-vis qualification, appointment, attitude, personality traits of prospective teacher educators. Furthermore, a mechanism for regular assessment of performances and consistency in commitment towards the profession could be explored.

REFERENCES

Ahammad, Faiyaz (2021). A study of professional commitment of teacher educators in relation to locality, gender and streams of study in the state of West Bengal. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349248437>

Arnab Pan (2016). Professional commitment of teacher educators of self financed b. ed. colleges of west Bengal. Retrieved from <http://journal.fakirchandcollege.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/JURNAL-PDF-3.pdf>

Dr. Razekul Islam, Moumita Das (2018). Professional commitment among B.Ed. teacher educators of Malda district in West Bengal. Retrieved from <https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT1807215.pdf>

Faiyaz Ahammad (2021). A study of professional commitment of teacher educators in relation to locality, gender and streams of study in the state of West Bengal. Retrieved from www.journalijar.com

Fateme Jafaraghaee, Abbas Ebadi, Reza Negarandeh and Neda Mehrdad (2017) A professional commitment scale for clinical nurses: A study protocol. doi: 10.14196/mjiri.31.123

National Curriculum Framework 2005.NCERT, Govt. of India. Retrieved from <https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/nc-framework/nf2005-english.pdf>



National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (2009-10). NCTE, Govt. of India.
Retrieved from https://ncte.gov.in/website/PDF/NCFTE_2009.pdf

National Policy of Education 1986 and Programme of Action 1992. MHRD, Govt. of India.
Retrieved from https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/npe.pdf

Ramzan Ali (2020). Professional commitment of teacher educators in colleges of education in Jammu district (J&K), *Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology* 17(6).
Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/hp/Downloads/3671-Article%20Text-7056-1-10-20201224.pdf

Report of Secondary Education Commission (1952). Govt. of India, Ministry of Education.
Retrieved from <https://tnschools.gov.in/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Report-of-the-secondary-education-commission-October-1952-June-1953.pdf>

Report of Education Commission (1964-66). Ministry of Education, Government of India.
Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/ReportOfTheEducationCommission1964-66D.S.KothariReport/48.Jp-ReportOfTheEducationCommission1964-66d.s.kothari_djvu.txt