

A Study on Faculty Engagement through Self Financing Institution in Chennai

Ms.L.Sarvizhi-1 & Dr.K.Malarvizhi-2

1- Ph.D Research Scholar, 2-Research Supervisor & HOD
PG & Research Department of Commerce,
Hindustan College of Arts & Science, padur, Chennai

Abstract

Faculty engagement (*FE*) depends on engaging students in active learning, inclusive teaching techniques, and online and hybrid teaching techniques. *FE* in higher education can boost student achievement and improve your institutions. Creating a pleasant environment in which staff feel encouraged to grow, develop, and discuss student success plans helps foster collaboration and boost contributions to campus culture. The current study focused on *FE* through self-financing institutions in Chennai. The study had a final sample size of 70 respondents. The acquired data is examined using SPSS, and methods such as “cross-tabulation”, “Chi-Square test”, and “ANOVA” are used to test the data. The study's findings indicate that vigor, as well as dedication, are the most important factors influencing teacher involvement. The H_0^1 , H_0^2 and H_0^3 are accepted, while one is rejected. There is a strong relationship among dedication, absorption, vigor, and total *FE*. Therefore, “ H_0^4 is no significant difference between monthly income and overall *FE*”.

Key Words: *FE*, Self financing, Chi-square, ANOVA

JEL: I, I23, P3

Introduction:

EE is the level of passion and dedication that employees have for their jobs and the workplace. It measures how devoted people are to assisting their business in achieving its objectives.

Effective *EE* relies on open communication and trust between employees and their employers. To increase *FE*, leaders should embody the organization's basic values, take pleasure in the firm, encourage professional development, and support each individual's ambitions.

Important Employee Engagement in Higher Education:

- **Improve productivity** - workers who are actively engaged are more expected to be motivated, critical thinkers, and take the initiative. This leads to higher productivity and performance.
- **Attract and retain top talent:** Workers that are engaged are additional liable to stay among their employer.
- **Improve the student experience:** Engaged faculty can lead to better students.

Employee Engagement Activities:

- Administrative center parties
- knowledge creativity
- Employee sports competition
- Teaching programs
- Team-building
- Fundraisers or donations
- Employee-led clubs

Benefits of Employee Engagement:

- Increased productivity
- High profitability
- Improved consumer fulfillment
- Reduced absenteeism

Here are some ways to improve employee engagement:

- Personalize communication
- Provide immediate feedback
- Provide growth opportunities and talent development
- Create individual goals
- Make an open work culture
- Give staff members the chance to speak openly with their bosses. Better pupils can result from engaged professors.
- Give staff members the chance to offer anonymous comments.

Factors Influencing Faculty Engagement in Higher Education:

1. Organizational Support

2. Task Variety
3. Feedback
4. Training, Learning, and Development
5. Compensation
6. Meaningful Work
7. Job Satisfaction
8. Relationships with Co-Workers

Review of Literature:

Thakur (2014) In the IT industry, there is a positive association between work happiness and *EE*, suggesting that *EE* positively influences job satisfaction. According to this, enhancing job authority and accountability can boost motivation among the previous employees. At the clerical level, job involvement is closely related to rewards and penalties.

Chandani and **Khokhar** (2016) discovered that 20 elements, including leadership, communication, career possibilities, organizational politics, work nature, compensation, treatment, and more, all have an impact on *EE*. They came to the conclusion that when employees are engaged, their intentions to leave the company decrease and their inventive work-related behaviour increase. An ongoing training program is essential. Firms can increase *EE* by encouraging prospect thinking, improving worker commitment and decision-making and fostering a sense of involvement and importance for their thoughts. Transparency in leadership will also result in high levels of *EE*.

Joseph and **Malini** (2017) the current study focuses on empirical research to determine the current levels of involvement among current employees of a few higher education institutions in a few South Indian colleges. They were evaluated using seven subscales: policies, motivating factors, public factors, personal-related factors, manager-related features, organizational-related factors, and hygiene elements. Along with the aforementioned engagement criteria, data analysis was conducted on a number of independent parameters, including age, gender, and work experience. The study's goals are to evaluate the level of involvement, look into the elements that affect staff retention, and identify the main obstacles to teacher retention in higher education. The findings revealed a positive connection between engaged staff and a favourable work environment.

Latasri and Kavitha (2017) the aim of the research paper was to classify the variables affecting *EE* in Tiruchirappalli Town's self-financing colleges. Using a convenient sample technique, 50 respondents are chosen for the study depending on their convenience. The data is analysed using ANOVA tables, chi-square tests, and cross-tabulation. According to the study, vigour is the most significant element impacting faculty involvement, whereas devotion is the least significant one. Monthly income and overall *EE* do not differ significantly.

Nautiyal (2020) the purpose of this study is to forecast *EE* and personal-efficacy in the higher institution in Chennai. A survey was completed by 804 individuals, who provided the data. The study made use of multiple regressions and descriptive statistics. The study concluded that universities are less than pressure to raise pupils learning results while also adapting to changing legal requirements and corporate needs.

Objectives

- ❖ To identify factors affecting *FE* in self-financed colleges.
- ❖ To investigate the difference between monthly income and overall *FE*.

Hypotheses

H0₁: “There is no difference between dedication and overall *EE*”

H0₂: “There is no difference between absorption and overall *EE*”

H0₃: “There is no difference between Vigor and overall *EE*”

H0₄: “There is no difference between monthly income and overall *EE*”

Methodology

Both primary and secondary data served as the base for this research. Primary data was gathered from Chennai-based colleges. Secondary data was gathered from the internet, other periodicals, etc. Faculties from various self-education institutions were interviewed and a standardized feedback form was used to gather primary data.

Even though 100 respondents received the questions, a sample of 70 respondents was used in this study. The response rate was 70% as a result. Google Forms was used to send an online

survey to every employee in the organisation. SPSS is used to examine the collected data, and tests such as ANOVA, Chi-Square, and cross-tabulation are employed.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Table-1
Descriptive Statistics Analysis

Particulars	Low level	High level	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Std. Deviation	Mean
Dedication	36(51%)	34(49%)	20	31	26.00	2.510	26.46
Absorption	36(51%)	34(49%)	25	36	29.00	2.489	29.40
Vigor	35(50%)	35(50%)	25	36	29.00	2.717	29.44
Overall Faculty Engagement	36(51%)	34(49%)	49	67	54.00	4.321	54.30

Source: Primary Data

Table 1 indicate that the most of the respondents significant factor influencing *FE* is Vigor (29.44), and the slightest significant factor influencing *FE* is dedication (26.46).

Table-2
Chi-square Analysis

Dedication	Overall Faculty Engagement (<i>OFE</i>)			Statistical Inference
	Low (36)	High (34)	Total = 70	0.11
Low level	28(78%)	8(22%)	36(51%)	
High level	8(24%)	26(76%)	34(49%)	

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 indicates chi-square values for dedication and overall *FE* in Chennai. The H_{01} shows that “*there is a significant association between dedication and overall FE*” ($p=0.011$).

Table 3
Chi-square Test

Absorption	OFE			Statistical Inference
	Low = 36	High = 34	Total = 70	0.11
Low level	28(78%)	8(22%)	36(51%)	
High level	8(24%)	26(76%)	34(49%)	

Source: Primary Data

Table 3 presents the Chi-squared statistics for absorption and total *FE* in Chennai. The **H0₂** show that “*there is a significant association between absorption and overall FE*” ($p=0.011$).

Table 4
Chi-square Test

Vigor	OFE			Statistical Inference
	Low = 35	High = 35	Total = 70	0.005
Low level	28(80%)	7(20%)	35(50%)	
High level	8(23%)	27(77%)	35(50%)	

Source: Primary Data

Table 4 displays the chi-square statistics for vigor and total *FE* in Chennai. The **H0₃** show that “*there is a significant association between Vigor and overall FE*” ($p=0.005 > 0.05$).

Table 5
Oneway ANOVA Result

	Mean	S.D	SS	d.f	MS	Statistical Inference
Dedication						
Between Groups			8.140	5	2.715	.742>0.05 Not Significant
Rs. 10000 to Rs. 15000 (n=51)	26.53	2.516				
Rs. 15500 to Rs. 20000 (n=9)	25.57	1.512				
Rs. 20500 to Rs. 25000 (n=6)	26.00	3.416				
Above 25000 (n=4)	25.00	1.412				
Within groups			302.167	69	6.600	
Absorption						
Between Groups			1.677	5	.517	.962>0.05 Not Significant
Rs. 10000 to Rs. 15000 (n=51)	29.39	2.498				
Rs. 15500 to Rs. 20000 (n=9)	29.67	2.010				
Rs. 20500 to Rs. 25000 (n=6)	26.00	3.265				
Above 25000	27.00	.000				
Within groups			302.365	69	6.524	
Vigor						
Between Groups			18.108	5	6.019	.599>0.05 Not Significant
Rs. 10000 to Rs. 15000 (n=51)	26.36	2.816				
Rs. 15500 to Rs. 20000 (n=9)	28.33	2.519				
Rs. 20500 to Rs. 25000 (n=6)	25.15	2.219				
Above 25000	25.50	2.121				
Within groups			358.112	69	7.486	
Overall Faculty						

Between Groups			30.329	5	10.123	.683>0.05 Not Significant
Rs. 10000 to Rs. 15000 (n=51)	55.59	4.418				
Rs. 15500 to Rs. 20000 (n=9)	56.77	4.923				
Rs. 20500 to Rs. 25000 (n=6)	53.15	6.561				
Above 25000	53.40	3.543				
Within groups			900.171	69	19.556	

Source: Primary Data

Table 5 displays the ANOVA results for monthly income and *FE* via self-financing in Chennai. **H₀₄** proves that “*there is no significant difference between monthly income and FE*” for the reason that $p=0.683$ which is $>.05$.

Findings of the study

- ✓ 65% of the faculties are women.
- ✓ All faculties are among 20-40 years of age
- ✓ 60% of the faculties are qualified up to PG with Ph.D.
- ✓ 70% of faculties are assistant professors.
- ✓ 80% of the faculties have a monthly income of Rs. 10000 - Rs. 15000.
- ✓ 68% of the faculties have 1 to 5 years of experience.

Conclusion

The researchers focused on *FE* through self-financing institutions in Chennai. The current paper is based on primary data, and secondary data. A feedback form was adopted for collecting primary data, and interviews have been conducted with faculties of different self-educational institutions. The study's ultimate sample size is 70 respondents. According to the findings of the study, vigor is the most significant element impacting *FE* among respondents, while dedication is the least significant factor. Therefore, “*there is a significant association between dedication, absorption, vigor, and overall FE*”. Further, **H₀₄** showed “*there is no significant difference between monthly income and overall FE*”.

Limitations and scope of the study

- ❖ Only 70 respondents from self-financing educational institutions were included in the study's analysis.
- ❖ Based on primary data from 2024.
- ❖ Although additional participants in the education sector may also be included, the survey took into account the many branches of a few colleges in south India.
- ❖ More areas across India can be considered for the survey to increase the sample size.
- ❖ Faculty from a variety of disciplines, including administration, science, and the arts, were taken into consideration in this study. However, for broad generalisations, other fields such as biotechnology, engineering, medicine, nursing, etc., can be taken into consideration.

Abbreviations:

- ❖ Faculty Engagement (FE)
- ❖ Employee Engagement (FE)
- ❖ Overall Faculty Engagement (OFE)

References

Lockwood. 2007. Employee engagement and employee retention. *European Journal of Business and Management* 2(3): 12-20.

Bijaya, K. S. 2011. Employee Engagement – Driver of Organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Business Management* 3(8): 1-8.

Padmakumar, R. and P. V. Gantasala. 2011. The role of employee engagement in work-related outcomes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business* 1(3): 47-61.

Thakur, P. 2014. A Research Paper on the Effect of Employee Engagement on Job Satisfaction in IT Sector. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research* 3(5):31-9.

Chandani, A. M, and V. Khokhar. 2016. Employee Engagement: A Review Paper on Factors Affecting Employee Engagement. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology* 9(15):2-7.

Joseph, R. and D. Malini. 2017. Employee Engagement of Faculties in Selected Higher Educational Institutes in South India. *IJARIE* 3(1):1700-7.

Latasri, O. T. V., and L. Kavitha. 2017. A Study on Faculty Engagement amongst Self Financing colleges at Tiruchirappalli Town. *Pezzottatte Journals* 6(2): 2730-5.

Nautiyal, M. 2020. Study of Employee Engagement in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Management* 11(5):2310-8.

Websites

<https://builtin.com/employee-engagement>

<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/employee-engagement.asp>

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/02/08/seven-ways-leverage-faculty-development-student-success>

<https://www.watermarkinsights.com/resources/blog/how-to-improve-faculty-engagement-for-student-success/>