

A STUDY ON FACULTY ENGAGEMENT AMONGST SELF FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTES AT RAIPUR CITY

Dr. Suresh Kumar Pattanayak; Dr. J.H.Vyas
Assistant Professor, Professor
Raipur Institute of Technology, Raipur Institute of Technology,
Raipur (C.G.) Raipur (C.G.)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to explore the engagement of faculty members teaching in self financing higher education institutions in Raipur. Through this paper the researchers are trying to find out the factors influencing faculty engagement in higher education institutes in Raipur city. The researchers have applied different statistical tools to analyze the data. This study reveals that the most important factor influencing is the proactiveness and less important factor is Enthusiasm.

Key Word: Faculty Engagement, Higher Education, Factors

INTRODUCTION

With the emergence of Globalization, there has been a great demand for competent employees in the organization. May it be a manufacturing sector, service sector, Banking sector, Marketing sector or education sector, there is high demand for committed human resources. These committed human resources need to be engaged fully and properly in the Institutions. The education sector is most challenging area where the employees (faculty) have to train the upcoming future bright minds so that they can face the challenges of job in global market.

Employee engagement can be defined as “the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization and put all efforts into their work”. Employee engagement is not the same as employee satisfaction. Organisation with an engaged workforce outperform in their jobs. Faculty engagement is proactiveness and the employee has to be multitask performer. The most important factor today is not just retaining the committed employees, but to be fully engage them with their minds, dedication and ideas. The proper engagement of employees leads to success of organization. Study shows that the connection between an employee’s job and organizational strategy, including understanding how important the job is to the Institutions success, is the most important driver of employee engagement.

IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

Since very less research work has been carried out in this subject in this area, the researchers have selected this topic for research. Education is a noble profession and the people associated with this area, have different mindset as compared to the mindset of business employees. For faculty in education sector, teaching is full commitment then compliance.

The common perception was that faculties who were highly involved in teaching engages the students that results in better learning. However, it is not so in reality. How does the faculty’s works motivates to see further in terms of performance is still a provocative question or an un-answered question? It is to analyze how universities and colleges should engage the faculties to enhance the student learning process? All these requires

a detailed analysis and put forward a model for further research. After going through several research papers few dimensions are considered to analyze this study. Dimensions used in the study are:

Enthusiasm: It refers to being strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, inspiration, pride and challenge.

Involvement at work: It is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work.

Proactiveness: It is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties.

Faculty Engagement: It refers to being engaged as per the norms of the Faculty profession like taking Lectures, preparing students for model designing, project works, making decision makers by empowering cases, roleplays etc.,

Salary: It refers to the remuneration paid to the faculties in the Institutes. Fact is to observe whether the remuneration what is being paid is whether as per the guidelines or norms associated with the profession and their eligibility criterions.

OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

- *To find out the factors influencing Faculty engagement in Self-financing Colleges.*
- *To know whether there exist a difference between Salary and faculty engagement.*

HYPOYHESES

- *There is no difference between Enthusiasm and Faculty Engagement.*
- *There is no difference between Involvement in work and Faculty Engagement.*
- *There is no difference between Proactiveness and Faculty Engagement.*
- *There is no difference between Salary and overall Faculty Engagement.*

METHODOLOGY USED

Collection of primary data has been done through structured questionnaire. The collected data is assessed in Likert 5 point scale in which 1 represents "Strongly Agree" and 5 represents "Strongly Disagree". As mentioned the sample size is 50 respondents and convenient sampling method is used based on convenience of the respondents. The secondary data is collected through newspapers, journals, magazines and websites etc. The Collected data are analyzed through SPSS and tools like cross tabulation, Chi-square test and ANOVA table etc.,

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table-1: Showing percentage wise factors of faculty engagement

	low	high	Min	max	median	s.d.	mean
Enthusiasm	26(52%)	24(48%)	10	21	16	2.514	16.46
Involvement in work	26(52%)	24(48%)	15	21	19	2.507	19.40
Proactiveness	25(50%)	25(50%)	15	26	19.5	2.734	19.44
Faculty Engagement	26 (52%)	24(48%)	48	66	55	4.538	55.30

Table-1 shows that the most important factor influencing employee engagement is Proactiveness (mean =19.44) and the least important factor influencing employee engagement is Enthusiasm (mean =16.46).

Cross tabs

Table-2: Chi-square Test Showing the Enthusiasm and Faculty Engagement

Enthusiasm	Overall Faculty engagement			
	Low(n=26)	High(n=24)	Total (n=50)	Statistical Inference
Low	18(69.2%)	8(33.3%)	26(52%)	$X^2 = 6.443$, d.f.=1
High	8 (30.8%)	16(66.7%)	24(48%)	.011 < 0.05

Table-2 shows that there is a significant association between Enthusiasm and faculty engagement ($p=0.011$ which is less than .05).

Table-3: Chi-square Test Showing the Involvement at work and Faculty Engagement

Involvement at work	Faculty engagement			
	Low(n=26)	High(n=24)	Total (n=50)	Statistical Inference
Low	18(69.2%)	8(33.3%)	26(52%)	$X^2 = 6.443$, d.f.=1
High	8 (30.8%)	16(66.7%)	24(48%)	.011 < 0.05

Table-3 shows that there is a significant association between Involvement in work and faculty engagement ($p=0.011$ which is less than .05).

Table-4: Chi-square Test Showing the Proactiveness and Faculty Engagement

Proactiveness	Faculty engagement			
	Low(n=26)	High(n=24)	Total (n=50)	Statistical Inference
Low	18(69.2%)	7(29.2%)	25(50%)	$X^2 = 8.013$, d.f.=1
High	8 (30.8%)	17(70.8%)	25(50%)	.005 < 0.05

Table-4 shows that there is a significant association between Proactiveness and faculty engagement ($p=0.005$ which is less than .05).

Table-5: One way ANOVA showing the significant difference between Salary and Faculty Engagement:

	Mean	S.D.	SS	d. f.	MS	Statistical Inference
Enthusiasm						
Between Groups			8.241	3	2.747	F=0.410 0.747>0.05 Not Significant
Rs.6000 to Rs.10000(n=41)	16.63	2.576				
Rs.10,500 to Rs.15,000(n=3)	15.67	1.528				
Rs.15,500 to Rs. 20,000(n=4)	16.00	3.464				
Above Rs.30,000 (n=2)	15.00	1.414				
Within groups			308.179	46	6.70	
Proactiveness						
Between Groups			18.208	3	6.06	F=0.79 0.97>0.05 Not Significant
Rs.6000 to Rs.10000(n=41)	19.46	2.812				
Rs.10,500 to Rs.15,000(n=3)	21.33	2.517				
Rs.15,500 to Rs. 20,000(n=4)	18.25	2.217				
Above Rs.30,000 (n=2)	18.50	2.121				
Within groups			348.113	46	7.568	
Involvement at Work						
Between Groups			30.339	3	10.12	F=0.801 0.497>0.05 Not Significant
Rs.6000 to Rs.10000(n=41)	55.49	4.214				
Rs.10,500 to Rs.15,000(n=3)	56.67	4.933				
Rs.15,500 to Rs. 20,000(n=4)	53.25	6.551				
Above Rs.30,000 (n=2)	53.50	3.536				
Within groups			900.161	46	19.567	
Faculty Engagement						
Between Groups			1.577	3	0.526	F=0.517 0.67>0.05 Not Significant
Rs.6000 to Rs.10000(n=41)	19.39	2.587				
Rs.10,500 to Rs.15,000(n=3)	19.67	2.082				
Rs.15,500 to Rs. 20,000(n=4)	19.00	3.162				
Above Rs.30,000 (n=2)	20.00	0.000				
Within groups			306.423	46	6.661	

*Sources: Primary Data

Table-5 shows that there is no significant difference between Salary and faculty engagement because $p = 0.673$ which is greater than .05

FINDINGS

- From the analysis it is found that 64% of the respondents are females.
- Maximum number of respondents is in the age group of between 20-40 years.
- 41% of the respondents are Post Graduates and 49% of the respondents are Assistant Professors.
- Three fourth of the respondents are earning a salary between Rs. 6,000 – Rs.10,000.
- Three fourth of the respondents are within an experience of 5 years.
- The most important factor influencing Faculty engagement is Proactiveness and the least important factor influencing Faculty engagement is Enthusiasm.
- There is a significant association between Enthusiasm and Faculty Engagement.
- There is a significant association between Involvement at work and Faculty Engagement.
- There is a significant association between Proactiveness and overall Faculty Engagement.
- There is no significant association between Salary and overall Faculty Engagement.

SUGGESTIONS

- Most of the respondents are Post Graduates and they are getting low salary .therefore the respondents should further enhance their qualifications.
- Enthusiasm of the faculty should be boosted as well as it should come from their own inner side.

CONCLUSION

From the above study it is concluded that most important factor influencing faculty engagement is proactiveness and least important factor is Enthusiasm. Out of four Hypotheses, three Hypothesis are accepted and one is rejected. Therefore there is a significant association between Enthusiasm, Involment at work and Proactiveness and faculty engagement. There is no significant difference between salary and faculty engagement.

REFERENCES

- Bijaya, Kumara Sundaray. (2011). Employee Engagement “A Driver of Organizational effectiveness”. *European Journal of Business Management*,3(8), 1-8.
- Labone, E. (2002), “The role of teacher efficacy in the development and prevention of teacher burnout”, unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane, Australia.
- Olivier, A.L. and Rothmann, S. (2007), “Antecedents of work engagement in a multinational oil company”, *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 49-56.
- Prachi,Verma. (2014). Indian Companies implementing best employees engagement practices without spending too much of money. *HR Digest*, 12, 76.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(6), 600-619.
- Padmakumar, Ram, & Prabhakar, Gantasala V. (2011). The role of employee engagement in work-related outcomes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(3), 47-61.
- Sharma, S.L. (2006), “Rethinking quality parameters in higher education” in Arya, P.P. (Ed.), *Higher Education and Global Challenges: Systems and Opportunities*, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi,pp-1-8
- Ramadevi, V. (2009), “Employee engagement is a two-way street”, *Human Resource Management International digest* vol.17 No.2 pp-3-4.
- Van, Rooy D. L., Whitman, D. S., Hart D., & Caleo, S. (2011). Measuring employee engagement during a financial downturn: Business imperative or nuisance? *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 26 (2), 147-152.