



# IJRASET

International Journal For Research in  
Applied Science and Engineering Technology



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

**Volume:** 10    **Issue:** I    **Month of publication:** January 2022

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2022.39731>

[www.ijraset.com](http://www.ijraset.com)

Call:  08813907089

E-mail ID: [ijraset@gmail.com](mailto:ijraset@gmail.com)

# Employee Engagement of Teaching Faculty Members in Higher Educational Institutions in Bengaluru

Deepa K<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Bhojanna U<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, University of Mysore

<sup>2</sup>Guide, Professor and Head, Department of Management, RNS Institute of Technology, Bengaluru

**Abstract:** *In this paper attempted to analyse Employee engagement of teaching faculty members in higher educational institutions. Dynamic work place environments require employee work engagement. Employee engagement refers to the degree to which employees are focused on and present in their roles. In today's competitive framework of work place environment employees may reach their cognitive and motivational limits and this may strain employees' attentiveness and engagement. This paper reviews research studies on employee engagement and performance link. Work Culture of today in Educational Institutions requires active engagement of teachers which affects their performance.*

**Keywords:** *Employee Engagement, Work Engagement, Job Performance, Educational Institutions*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Kahn (1990) defined Personal Engagement as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” Kahn (1992 ) suggests that engagement captures an employee’s psychological presence, or “being there.” Psychological presence is defined as the extent to which people are attentive, connected, integrated, and focused in their role performances. Rothbard (2001) is of the view that Work engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is persistent and pervasive. It is not focused on any particular object, event, individual or behaviour. Employee Engagement, Work Engagement are terms used interchangeably (Schaufeli 2010)Schaufeli et al. (2002) which describes employee/ work engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor (e.g., being highly energetic), dedication (e.g., being highly involved in work), and absorption (e.g., being highly concentrated in work)”. Other terms used are like organizational engagement and job engagement. Saks (2006)defined Job engagementas “the extent to which an individual is psychologically present in a workrole”. Macey and Schneider (2008) as cited in Nienaber and Martins (2014) proposed a framework of employee engagement at three levels viz: Individual-, team/department- and organizational level. Individual level includes factors of Trait, State and behavioural engagement which are influenced by work design, leadership and trust representing the team level. These aspects are in turn influenced by vision, mission, goals and strategy which are anchored in competitive advantage of the organization and represent the organizational level Shuck and Wollard(2010) defines employee engagementas “a cognitive, emotional, and behavioural state directed towarddesired organizational outcomes”. Christian et al. (2011) state Work engagementas “a relatively enduring state of mind referring to the simultaneous investment of personal energies in the experience or performance of work”.

Engagement is consistently shown as something given by the employee which can benefit the organisation through commitment and dedication, advocacy, discretionary effort, using talents to the fullest and being supportive of the organisation’s goals and values. Engaged employees feel a sense of attachment towards their organisation, investing themselves not only in their role, but in the organisation as a whole. Although a relatively new concept, the topic of employee engagement has rapidly attracted attention in the course of the last decade.

### A. Need of Employee Engagement in the Organisation

Industrialization and subsequent division of labour an employee who used multiple faculties to perform his job, is reduced to doing a small part of job earlier. Doing the same small role every day has increased monotony and mechanical performance of the job. The worker does not have to say or autonomy to do the work as the process is already defined by his superiors or managers.

This has led to job dissatisfaction and detachment towards work leading to disengagement in extreme cases. The level of disengagement is rising in all sectors including teaching. The worker has to be engaged to give the best of his abilities to his work role. So there is a need to study engagement of workers to not only improve performance but also to maintain it.

### *B. The study's Importance and Necessity*

With the implementation of the 6th pay commission in government universities, there was a surge of enthusiasm among young professionals to pursue careers in academia. Many professionals are entering the teaching area to perform research and share their valuable industrial expertise with young students, as many universities place a focus on faculty research. Due to a lack of opportunities for good research, these professionals will pursue PhD degrees and teach in other countries. However, with the Indian higher education system providing equal opportunities for research, young Indian faculty members are flocking to fill faculty positions, providing valuable experience to young Indian students. The number of publications in prestigious journals has increased in recent years, as has the amount of joint research with foreign institutes, highlighting the value of Indian faculty. Many colleges have faculty exchange programmes.

Through collaborations with other universities, Indian professors gain exposure to the research climate in other countries, increasing their chances of publishing in prestigious journals. With so many universities competing for outstanding faculty with research credentials, keeping a faculty member is difficult. As a result, research into the involvement of Indian faculty in higher education is required. With the government placing a strong emphasis on higher education, more IITs and IIMs, as well as central universities and specialised institutes catering to specific industries such as plantation and securities, are being established to train manpower for the growing demand for employees with specific skill sets. To meet the demand for fresh courses, the private sector has built new departments and courses tailored to the needs of the industry, such as retail, big data, and robotics.

The demand for online courses from colleges has also expanded to meet the demand for workers with ever-changing skill sets. As a result, more people are pursuing PhD degrees in the academic and industrial sectors, and the demand for faculty with industrial expertise who can cater to specialist niches has skyrocketed. Faculty teaching in numerous institutes has increased as demand for faculty has increased and supply has taken its time. As a result, it is necessary to

It's much more critical to keep faculty members engaged in their work. This empirical investigation is a step in the right direction.

### *C. The Benefits of Engagement*

'Work engagement is a positive experience in itself' (Schaufeli et al, 2002 cited in Sonnentag, 2003). 'Employee engagement is a hard-nosed proposition that not only shows results but can be measured in costs of recruitment and employee output' (Johnson, 2004 p.1). As the latter quotation suggests, there are numerous outcomes of investing in improving employee engagement and there is a fair amount of consistency in the practitioner and academic literature regarding the benefits of doing so. These benefits can be broadly categorised in organisational outcomes and employee outcomes.

#### *1) From an Organisational Perspective*

- a) Engaged employees are more likely to stay with the organisation (Levinson, 2007) and are more likely to 'stick around' when the organisation is struggling to survive (BlessingWhite, 2008).
- b) Engaged employees perform 20 per cent better than their colleagues (Corporate Leadership Council, 2004); they are more willing to go the 'extra mile'; and they act as advocates of the organisation (Scottish Executive Social Research, 2007).
- c) Engagement can have a significant impact on the performance of the organisation, driving bottom-line profit through increased productivity, customer loyalty, increased sales or better retention levels (Cleland et al, 2008)
- d) Engagement can improve organisational agility in companies and organisations forced to adapt to changing markets, and improve efficiency in driving change initiatives (Graen, 2008).

#### *2) From an Employee Perspective*

- a) Engagement may enable individuals to invest themselves fully in their work (Seijts and Crim, 2006); with increased self-efficacy and a positive impact upon the employee's health and well-being (Mauno et al, 2007; Rothbard, 2001); which in turn evokes increased employee support for the organization.

### *D. Strategic Vision and Change Management*

'The future workforce requirements for the HE sector will be largely influenced by the factors driving change for HE sector nationally and globally. Staff in HE must continue to adapt and change in response to these factors and the new expectations on staff, in order to maintain a high-quality higher education sector. Similar to organisations in the private sector, public sector organisations experience major changes in their policy environment which they need to adapt to.

Confronted with constraints in budget, legislation and the needs of the related public institutions they are serving, transformations may become even more challenging for public sector institutions (Banks, 2006). In addition to these challenges, research findings suggest that the public sector's performance in areas relating to strategic vision and change management, both crucial elements for employee engagement, is weaker than that of the private sector (Scottish Executive Social Research, 2007). Moreover, as Archer (2005) notes, the rich heritage of universities may sometimes result in a 'robust resistance to change'. In order to effectively deal with the challenges with which HEIs are currently confronted, these institutions need to be both flexible and agile. With strategic workforce planning remaining a relatively under-developed HR management process in HE, stimulating change as part of strategic development is more difficult for HEI (HEFCE, 2010)

#### *E. Line Communication and Leadership*

'Effective performance management and high-quality leadership, governance and management are essential in forming the foundation of a successful, high-quality HE workforce.' Strategic human resource management plays a crucial role in institutional success of HEIs. In light of the changing environment within which HEIs are operating, more and more institutions are modernizing their HR management another issue that Archer describes is that of a range of institutional arrangements in HEIs which might hinder an effective line manager-employee relationship

#### *F. Recognition and Reward*

While the literature often suggests that public sector workers are more engaged in their work due to an intrinsic reward afforded by performing public service, often referred to as 'public sector ethos', employee surveys do not always support this assumption (Gatenby et al, 2009). Also in the HE setting, rewards and incentives need to strike a balance between extrinsic, primarily monetary; and intrinsic, nonfinancial, motivators. Using the example of the University of Montreal, Mathieu (2003) describes how an HEI achieved this difficult balance through increased 'support and recognition' for the period between appointment and the granting of tenure. In more general terms, the issue of how to link professional and organisational development in a way that motivates HE staff, is a subject widely discussed in the literature (see for example Gordon, 2003). Moreover, as in other sectors, pay and reward are crucial factors for maintaining an engaged workforce in the HE sector. Particularly, HEIs have to find a way to strike a balance between adequately rewarding people for their contributions while remaining affordable and not threatening the institution's future financial sustainability (HEFCE, 2010).

#### *G. Developing a Culture Supportive of Engagement*

'One question still challenges many organizations in their quest to improve performance: What can be done to significantly impact employee engagement?' (People Management, 2008). Improving levels of employee engagement does not have to be expensive; it just takes some time and energy, but benefits will outweigh these costs (Bates, 2004). In 2004 IES proposed (Robinson et al, p.xii), that attempts to increase levels of engagement are likely to be ineffective, unless several factors are present in the organization:

- 1) Good quality line management
- 2) Two-way communication
- 3) Effective internal co-operation
- 4) A focus on development
- 5) Commitment to employee wellbeing
- 6) Clear, accessible HR policies and practices and visible commitment to these by Managers at all levels.

These clearly resemble the common drivers found in the literature; namely the nature of the work, work that has transparent meaning and purpose, development opportunities, receiving timely recognition and rewards, building respectful and assertive relationships, having open and honest two-way communication and consultation systems, and having inspiring leadership.

#### *H. Seven Drivers of Engagement*

There are seven commonly referenced drivers of engagement:

- 1) The nature of the work undertaken
- 2) Work that has transparent meaning and purpose
- 3) Development opportunities
- 4) Receiving timely recognition and rewards

- 5) Building respectful and assertive relationships
- 6) Having open two-way communication systems, and
- 7) Inspiring leadership.

Although mainly based on private sector research, these identified drivers for Engagement can have significant implications for public sector institutions' performances.

#### *I. Objective of the Study*

- 1) To measure employee engagement levels of faculties
- 2) To find out the factors which contribute to engagement of faculties.

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

In the academic literature, a number of definitions have been provided for the term employee engagement. In his qualitative paper —Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work |Kahn (1990, p. 694) defines personal engagement as —the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles, in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. | Personal disengagement refers to —the uncoupling of selves from work roles, in disengagement, people withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively, or emotionally during role performances| (p. 694). Thus, according to Kahn (1990, 1992), engagement means to be psychologically present when occupying and performing an organizational role.

Rothbard (2001, p. 656) also defines engagement as psychological presence but goes further to state that it involves two critical components: attention and absorption. Attention refers to —cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role| while absorption —means being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one's focus on a role. Douglas May tested Kahn's theory in the paper —the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, availability and engagement of human spirit at work| in 2004 of the effects of the three psychological conditions psychological meaningfulness, physiological safety and psychological availability on employee engagement. His research proved that these three conditions impacted on employee engagement in varying ways. In the results meaningfulness displayed the strongest relation. The work role fit and job enrichment positively linked to psychological meaningfulness. The reward and supportive supervisor relations were positively linked to psychological safety. Self consciousness and adherence to co-worker norms negatively affected psychological safety while resources availability were positively related to psychological availability. Participation in outside activities negatively related to psychological availability.

Schaufeli et al. (2002, p. 74) define engagement —as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. | They further state that engagement is not a momentary and specific state, but rather, it is —a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior|

Methodology/Design:

## **III. METHODOLOGY**

### *A. Data Collection*

The present research is a cross sectional descriptive study and is based on primary data. The primary data has been collected from colleges having branches in south Bengaluru. A structured questionnaire was adopted for collecting primary data as also the literature and interview has been conducted with faculties of different educational institutes.

Secondary sources include information from the practitioners articles, journals, periodicals, magazines.

### *B. The Tool*

A detailed questionnaire is designed keeping in view the objectives of the study and administered among sample respondents. The questionnaire has two sections, with five point Likert rating scale, ranging, 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=can't say, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.

The questionnaire consisting of 12 questions was made after referring to Gall Q12 questions on employee engagement.

- 1) *Section A:* Personal information of respondents was sought. It constitutes age group, experience, gender, government or private sector of the respondents.
- 2) *Section B:* This section is regarding factors of nurses retention, questions were designed on seven sub scales viz: measuring hygiene factors, policy factors, motivational factors, people factors, self-related factors, manager related factors, organization related factors.

**C. Sample Size**

Samples of 111 responses was included for this study although questions were sent to 250 respondents. Hence response rate was 44%.All the employees of the company was sent an online questionnaire through googledocs and some were collected through hardcopy of the questionnaire.

**D. Sampling Method**

Simple random sampling method was adopted. It is a probability sampling technique .Respondents considered for data collection were at various positions at senior, middle and at entry level of the educational sector.

**IV. DATA ANALYSIS**

**A. Gender**

Table 1.1:showing the frequency of gender

Gender of Respondents	Numbers	(%)
Male	75	67.5
Female	36	32.5
Total	111	100

**B. Experience**

Table 1.2: showing the frequency of experience in current organization

Work experience	0-5 year	5-10 yrs	10-15 years	15-20 years	Total
Number	34	28	30	19	111
%	36.6	25.20	27	17.11	100

**C. Designation**

Table 1.3:showing the designation

Designation	Numbers	%
Associate Professors	14	12.6
Assistant Professors	41	36.9
Senior lectures	32	28.8
Junior lectures	24	21.6

**D. Government or Private sector**

Table 1.4 showing the sector

Sector	Numbers	(%)
Government	26	23.4
Private	40	36
Semi government	45	40.5
	111	100

Table 1.5 Descriptive statistics for Hygiene factors, Policy, Motivational, People, Self, Managerial, Organizational factors.

	Total (111)	
Items	Mean	SD
Descriptive statistics for Self		
1) Do you know what is expected of you at work?	3.69	2.09
Descriptive statistics for Hygiene factors		
2) Do you have the materials and equipment to do your work right?	3.91	1.148
Descriptive statistics for Policy factors		
3) At work, do you have the opportunity to do what you do best every day?	3.30	2.060
12) In the last year, have you had opportunities to learn and grow?	3.82	2.40
Descriptive statistics for Managerial factors		
4) In the last seven days, have you received recognition or praise for doing good work?	2.88	2.16
5) Does your supervisor, or someone at work, seem to care about you as a person?	3.47	2.03
Descriptive statistics for People factors		
6) is there someone at work who encourages your development?	3.23	2.116
9) Are your associates (fellow employees) committed to doing quality work?	3.33	2.10
10) Do you have a best friend at work?	3.53	2.190
11) In the last six months, has someone at work talked to you about your progress?	3.10	2.56
Descriptive statistics for Motivational factors		
7) At work, do your opinions seem to count?	3.18	2.12
Descriptive statistics for Organization		
8) Does the mission/purpose of your company make you feel your job is important?	3.57	1.99
*number in brackets denotes the number of respondents		

**E. Interpretation:**

The first question in the table shows the responses of respondents on factors related to self. Most of the respondents feel that their department employees know what to do at work with (mean=3.69).

The second question in the table show the responses of respondents on factors related to Hygienic factors. Respondents are happy that the company has the materials and equipments. (mean=3.91).

The third question in the table indicates the responses for policy factors. The respondents strongly agree that they have the opportunity to do what they do best every day with (mean = 3.30). The respondents strongly agree have you had opportunities to learn and grow with (mean = 3.82).

The table show the responses of respondents on managerial factors in question fourth and fifth. In the last seven days, have you received recognition or praise for doing good work. Respondents are happy that the company has given them recognition or praise for doing good work with (mean=2.88). Respondents strongly agree that their supervisor, or someone at work, seem to care about you as a person with (mean = 3.47). The sixth question in the table indicates response for people factors. The respondents do agree that there is someone at work who encourages your development with (mean= 3.23). Respondents also agree that their associates (fellow employees) committed to doing quality work with (mean= 3.33). Respondents agree that do you have a best friend at work with (mean=3.53). Respondents agree that in the last six months, has someone at work talked to you about your progress with (mean 3.10). The seventh question in the table indicates the responses for motivational factors. The respondents strongly agree At work, do your opinions seem to count with (mean = 3.18).

The result of the eighth question indicates the responses of all the respondents on organizational factors. Respondents strongly agree that the mission/purpose of your company make you feel your job is important (mean= 3.57).

## V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Our empirical study of select educational institutes of Bengaluru as an example has confirmed it that conducive work environment, fair treatment by supervisor, good relations with colleagues and proper facilities to do the work goes a long way in improving engagement of faculties. Many of the faculties were happy with the work environment in their colleges.

With many colleges becoming research oriented, the management has taken steps to send faculties to latest training workshop related to research like SEM, SPSS, doctoral conferences. In some cases the colleges have started their own research programmes with financial concessions for their own faculties to improve the level of enrolment in doctoral programmes. The cost of attending conferences national and international is also being funded by the colleges to improve the research output among faculties along with reduction in teaching workload. Such kind of faculty friendly policies have to be continued to get good output. In case of any problem, the supervisors and colleagues would discuss and solve the issues which help in promoting a congenial work environment. Many of the faculties have been provided with laptops and access to popular databases like Ebsco, Proquest and WGSN to improve the level of updation to the latest trends in research in their own fields. That has increased the motivation and commitment of faculties to their jobs and led to the increase in publications of articles in good journals.

### A. Limitations Of The Study

The researcher was able to take responses from faculties from select colleges in Bengaluru. It is assumed that the respondents have provided genuine inputs and reflect true experience. The engagement levels of male and female faculties have not been analyzed separately.

### B. Scope For Further Research

The different branches of select colleges in Bengaluru was considered for survey but other players in the education industry also can be included. More areas across Karnataka can be considered for the survey to increase the sample size.

In this study faculties from all streams like arts, science, management and engineering were considered. But other areas like biotechnology, medical, nursing can be considered for broad generalizations. This study can be done age wise to include the engagement of faculties in pure teaching or pure research. Detailed analysis with more statistical tools can be done to find more conclusions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] <https://q12.gallup.com/public>
- [2] Likert scale is a scale commonly involved in research that employs questionnaire and is the most widely used approach to scaling responses in survey research
- [3] <http://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/4192/1/19wempen.pdf>
- [4] [www.ibef.org](http://www.ibef.org)
- [5] [https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/hallamleaders/files/2018/01/employee\\_engagement\\_in\\_the\\_he\\_sector\\_-\\_evidence\\_review.pdf](https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/hallamleaders/files/2018/01/employee_engagement_in_the_he_sector_-_evidence_review.pdf)
- [6] EMPLOYEE\_ENGAGEMENT\_OF\_FACULTIES\_IN\_SELECT\_HIGHER\_EDUCATIONAL\_INSTITUTES\_IN\_SOUTH\_INDIA\_ijarie3957 Bibliography
- [7] Bakker, A.B., and Demerouti, E. (2008), "Towards a model of work engagement", *Career Development International*, Vol. 13 (3), pp. 209-223. Page 36 of 42 8.
- [8] Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P., & Taris, T.W. (2008), *Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology*, *Work and Stress*, Vol. 22, pp. 187-200
- [9] Bakker, A.B., Gierveld, J.H., & Van Rijswijk, K. (2006), "Success factors among female school principals in primary teaching: A study on burnout, work engagement, and performance", *Right Management Consultants*, Diemen, The Netherlands
- [10] Borman, W. C. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1993), Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance, in N. Schmitt and W. Borman (eds), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, New York, pp. 71- 98
- [11] tests: Constructs
- [12] Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., Slaughter, J.E. (2011), *Work engagement: a quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance*, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 89-136.
- [13] Gupta, M., Acarya, A., Gupta, R. (2015) *Impact of Work Engagement on Performance in Indian Higher Education System*. *Review of European studies*. Vol.7 No.3
- [14] Kahn, W. (1990). *Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4), pp. 692-724.
- [15] Kilonzo, T.M., Were, S., Odhiambo, R. (2018). *Influence of Employee Engagement on the Performance of Teachers in Secondary Schools in Machakos County in Kenya*. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences* Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp: (52-71).
- [16] Macey, W.H. & Schneider, B. (2008), "The Meaning of Employee Engagement", *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1 (2008), pp. 3-30.
- [17] Maha Ahmed Zaki Dajani (2015). *The Impact of Employee Engagement on Job Performance and Organisational Commitment in the Egyptian Banking Sector*. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*. Vol. 3, No. 5, 2015, pp 138-147. doi: 10.12691/jbms-3-5-1
- [18] Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C. and Schmit, M. J. (1997) *A Theory of Individual differences in Task and Contextual Performance*, *Human Performance*, Vol. (10), pp. 71-83.





10.22214/IJRASET



45.98



IMPACT FACTOR:  
7.129



IMPACT FACTOR:  
7.429



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089  (24\*7 Support on Whatsapp)