

Dutifulness and Social Responsibility of School Teachers

Armin Mahmoudi¹

Assistant Professor, Department of Studies in Education, Yasouj branch, Islamic Azad University,
Yasouj, Iran

Abstract. Dutifulness or social responsibilities are indispensable characteristics for all human beings. The sense that which reminds man to lend hands to hold responsibility is called dutifulness. A self constructed rating scale by the authors was used to measure five sample of 61 teachers were selected from three different educational set up.e.g., Government, private and self financed schools from Shiraz city. The result are discussed in detail in the paper with regard to age differences, institutional setup and gender differences on all the dimensions Teachers are the agents of social change and are the beacon of light and role models to the students. The study has implication to build the moral character of students by bringing about the beneficial interactions with people in the society.

Key words: Dutifulness, Social responsibility, School teachers, society, Shiraz

1. Introduction

Man is a unique creation of nature and a rational social being. Dutifulness or social responsibilities are indispensable characteristics for all mankind. Giving and taking are inseparable and inter-related with each other. The sense of feeling which reminds man to lend hands or hold responsibility for the fellowmen is called 'Dutifulness'. Dutifulness implies, the fulfillment of obligations and performance of functions or service, motivated purely by a sense of one's own convictions without any fear of punishment or hope of any reward, but only for love. This dedication of service will promoted progress and make subscription to the growth of man.(Nazareth & Wales,1979) Concern for others ensures meaningfulness to life. In this context teachers have to play a vital role. He has to dispel ignorance from the minds of students and build a healthy society. A good society depends upon good human conduct. The attitude of individuals is responsible for the proper functioning of the society (Das,2004).Family is the basic unit of the society. good and supportive relationship in the family encourages and enhances an attitude of dutifulness.(Patel,2005).It is obligatory to realize one's duties to the society and nation. The youth are vital for developing dutifulness ideology in their formative period of manhood(Bakshi,1991).Swami Vivekananda believed that the younger generation is the messengers of his ideals and the implementers of the service expected by the society and nation. They need shouldering the responsibility of the nation to work out the whole problem like lions. Even the least work done for others awakens the power within; even thinking the least good of others gradually instills into the heart the strength of a lion. According to mother Theresa all inhabitants of this earth are deserted from heaven and in the real since they are destitute, they are needed to be cared for by magnanimous humane touch.(Chitkara.1998).The objective of this study was to find out the level of duty consciousness of the school teachers and to explore the hurdles they face in executing their duties. Further the study also investigated the differences in Dutifulness with reference to sex,age, residential area and the type of school the teachers work.

2.1. Sample:

The sample consisted of 61 teachers, from three different type of educational institutes, namely, government schools, private schools and self financed schools were chosen randomly out of the total list of schools in Shiraz City.

2.2. Tool Used

1)Rating scale on Dutifulness (Self Constructed)The rating scale on Dutifulness consisted of 25 items which measured Duty to God, to Self, to the Institution, to the community, and to the Nation. Higher the score on the scale better was the dutifulness. The scale items were distributed equally for all the indices. The reliability of the scale was established through test retest method. The obtained reliability was r^{tt} :0.77.Validity was established by the consensus of the experts in the field.

2)Bio data inventory: It tapped on the pertinent demographic information on the teachers selected for the study.

2.3. Result and Discussion

Table:1 shows that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers with reference to dutifulness to God, irrespective of locality and sex differences. But, there were significant differences between duty to oneself and family(t :2.04; df :60; p <0.05) vis-a-vis locality. The urban population mean score(M :24.43) was significantly higher than the rural population(M :22.95).On the index Duty to the Institution the urban population(M :23.46)had significantly(t :99; df :60; p <0.05)higher mean score than the rural population(M :21.91)On the measure of Duty to Community there was significant sex difference(t :2.22, df :60; p <0.05)where the females had higher mean scores (M :6.44)Than the males(M :5.76).As for the Duty to the Nation, again there was significant difference between rural(M :22.23)and urban(m :26.54) population, the later having significantly higher mean scores(t :5.44; df :60; p <0.01).On the overall assessment of dutifulness the urban population was significantly more Duty conscious(M :83.92)than rural(M :79.68)population (t :2.16; df :60; p <2.16).Thus, the place of residence plays a vital role in upholding responsibility of various kinds. By and large, the urban population was more duty conscious and were committed to social responsibility than the rural population which could be due to the exposure to various politico-social consciousness.

Table1:Mean,SD ,t values with significance level of scores on Dutifulness with reference to gender and place

Dimensions	Variable	Category	Mean	SD	T value	
Duty to the God	Sex	Male	30	3.32	0.90	0.05
		Female	31	3.33	0.93	
	Locality	Rural	25	3.50	0.51	1.33
		Urban	36	3.23	1.06	
Duty to Oneself,Family	Sex	Male	30	23.72	2.82	0.51
		Female	31	24.08	2.67	
	Locality	Rural	25	22.95	3.26	2.04*
		Urban	36	24.49	2.21	
Duty to the Institution	Sex	Male	30	22.360	3.25	1.18
		Female	31	23.28	2.74	
	Locality	Rural	25	21.91	3.13	1.99*
		Urban	36	23.46	2.76	
Duty to the community	Sex	Male	30	5.75	1.30	2.22*
		Female	31	6.44	1.08	
	Locality	Rural	25	6.09	1.48	0.29
		Urban	36	6.21	1.56	
Duty to the Nation	Sex	Male	30	25.28	3.71	1.56
		Female	31	26.61	2.86	
		Rural	25	22.23	2.65	5.44**

	Locality	Urban	36	26.54	3.52	
Dolefulness	Sex	Male	30	80.44	8.68	1.68
		Female	31	83.75	6.44	
Overall dutifulness	Locality	Rural	25	79.68	7.76	2.16*
		Urban	36	83.92	7.27	

**P <0.01 *P<0.05 level of significance

Table 2: Mean ,F values and significant differences on various dimensions of Dutifulness and age levels of teachers

Dimensions	Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Square	F-Value
Duty to the God	Less than 30	BG	4.24	1.78
	30 to 40 years	WG	45.21	
	41-50 years	Total	49.44	
	Above 50			
Duty to Family and self	Less than 30	BG	131.97	8.09*
	30 to 40 years	WG	309.76	
	41-50 years	Tl	441.73	
	Above 50			
Duty to the Institution	Less than 30	BG	1.28	3.59*
	30 to 40 years	WG	87.08	
	41-50 years	Total	88.36	
	Above 50			
Duty to the Community	Less than 30	BG	1.28	0.28
	30 to 40 years	WG	87.08	
	41-50 years	Total	88.36	
	Above 50			
Duty to the Nation	Less than 30	BG	100.82	3.53*
	30 to 40 years	WG	542.91	
	41-50 years	Total	643.73	
	Above 50			

**p<0.01, *p<0.05

The age however acts as a factors that would determine the dutifulness in individuals while performing duty to the Female (F:8.09,P<0.01) Institution (F:3.59,P<0.05) and the Nation (F:3.53,P<0.05)There is a significant difference existing among the different age groups.

Table-3 has indicated that teacher's dutifulness had different with reference to the type of institution (F:4.49,P<0.05), they are working with, specially in the areas of Duty to Self, to Family (F:10.95,p<0.01),to the Institution and to the Community(F:4.75,P<0.05).

Table:3 Mean, 'F' values and significance level on different dimensions of Dutifulness and the type of school representations.

Dimension	Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Square	F value
Duty to the Almighty	Govt.	BG	4.31	2.77
	Private		45.12	
	Self	WG	49.44	
	Financed		Total	

Duty to Family and Self	Govt.	BG WG Total	118.16	10.95*
	Private		323.57	
	Self		441.73	
	Financed			
Duty to the Institution	Govt.	BG WG Total	70.92	4.49*
	Private		458.48	
	Self		529.41	
	Financed			
Duty to the Community	Govt.	BG WG Total	12.44	4.75*
	Private		75.92	
	Self		88.36	
	Financed			
Duty to the Nation	Govt.	BG WG Total	31.72	1.55
	Private		612.01	
	Self		643.73	
	Financed			

**p<0.01,*p<0.05

Table 4:Mean, 'F' values and significant differences on Dutifulness between teachers in terms of age and type of Institution

Variable	Category	Mean	'F' value
Duty Consciousness	Less than 30 years	76.80	7.21*
	30 to 40 years	85.26	
	41-50 years	83.55	
	Above 50 years	86.33	
Duty Consciousness	Govt.	83.82	8.16**
	Private	85.32	
	Self-Financial	76.76	

**p<0.01

Table 4 has shown significant differences between age($F:7.26;P<0.01$)and the type of institutions($F:8.16;P<0.01$)ON Duty Consciousness The age group 30 to 40 and the Private institution's teachers showed significantly higher duty consciousness than the other groups.

Dutifulness or coming forward to shoulder responsibility is both a national and personal value of the individual. The life should be a model to show how man should conduct himself in public life. Without serving others one can not get real pleasure. No doubt there is a spirit of sacrifice and one may have to forego material benefits to be in the spirit of dutifulness.(Veeramani,2005).

The place of residence plays a vital role in upholding responsibility of various kinds. Rural and urban residents are differing in their performance of dutifulness in relation with family, institution and nation.

3. Acknowledgements

I am thankful of Professor Attaolah Eftekhari for his helping in this case.

4. References

- [1] Bakshi.S.R.(1991),Raja Gopalachari:Role in Freedom Movement,Ammol Publications, Shiraz-53,P.90.
- [2] Chitkara, M.G.(1998).Mother Teresa, APH publishing corporation,Arak.P.136.
- [3] Nazareth,MP,&Waples,M.E,(1979),Neighbourley Values,AINACS,Mashhad.
- [4] Das,R.(2004) Gandhi and Mao:In Quest Of Analogy,Sarup and Sons, ESfahan -2,P.216.
- [5] Patel,T.(2005),(Ed).The Family in India.Sage Publication Team,ESfahan,P.214.
- [6] Veeramani.K(2005).Collected works of periyar E.V.R.,The Periyar Self-Respect Propaganda Institution,Tabrez.P.583-585