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Abstract

An engaged faculty will show a high degree of commitment and involvement in the profession. For him/her teaching is more of commitment than compliance. Important thing to be noticed here is where this commitment and involvement of a faculty reflect upon? This paper tries to go deeper into the analysis of justifying what engages the faculties of management colleges and institutions in such a way that it enhances the students’ performance.
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Introduction

“Employee engagement is best defined as the degree of commitment to a particular job. Commitment, in the work context, can be separated into rational commitment – which is driven by self-interest or the belief that engaging will result in something of value such as financial reward or professional development – and emotional commitment – which is driven by a deeper belief in the job, other employees or the organization as a whole. The most tangible measures of employee engagement are how hard an employee works and how long they stay as a result of that commitment.” (Martin Stairs, 2005).

According to the Gallup the Consulting organization there are different types of people:-

- Engaged—“Engaged” employees are builders.”
- Not engaged—“Not-engaged employees tend to concentrate on tasks rather than the goals and outcomes they are expected to accomplish.”
- Actively disengaged—“The "actively disengaged" employees are the "cave dwellers." They're "Consistently against virtually everything."

This paper revolves around in identifying what engages the faculties of management studies most. There are 10 C’s of employee engagement (Gerard H. Seijts and Dan Crim, 2006): connect, clarity, convey, congratulate, contribute, control, collaborate, credibility, confidence, career. How far this 10 c’s help to justify these three different types of people mentioned above? In this paper we look forward to understand where these 10’ cs affect the faculty engagement. And then by doing a factor analysis we will stream line how faculties of management studies can be engaged effectively, so that it enhances the student’s performance. By identifying those factors we hope to engage the faculties of management studies in a much more effective way.
Review of literature

Most often employee engagement has been defined as emotional and intellectual commitment to the organization (Baumruk 2004, Richman 2006 and Shaw 2005) or the amount of discretionary effort exhibited by employees in their job (Frank et al 2004). Engagement is most closely associated with the existing construction of job involvement (Brown 1996) and flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Job involvement is defined as ‘the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his or her identity (Lawler & Hall, 1970). In the 21st century, creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship became critical factors for modern prosperity (Carden, 2008). Following this trend, there is a significant student demand for business education that provides the required skill set to succeed in an increasingly diverse business environment (Cooper, Bottomley, & Gordon, 2004). According to Buckingham & Coffman (1999), “People don’t change that much. Don’t waste time trying to put in what was left out. Try to draw out what was left in. That is hard enough”. These words came from the interview conducted by Gallup which studied thousands of managers. It clearly pins down the development of strengths. According to Nitin Vazirani (2007) Dean in OB and HR, SIES College of Management Studies there are three basic aspects of employee engagement according to the global studies are-

- The employees and their own unique psychological make up and experience
- The employers and their ability to create the conditions that promote employee engagement
- Interaction between employees at all levels.

Robinson et al (2004) state that: “…engagement contains many of the elements of both commitment and OCB but is by no means a perfect match with either. In addition, neither commitment nor OCB reflect sufficiently two aspects of engagement - its two way nature, and the extent to which engaged employees are expected to have an element of business awareness.” Saks (2006) mentioned in his study that organizational commitment differs from engagement that it reflects person’s attitude and attachment towards organization, whilst it could be argued that engagement is not merely an attitude; it is the degree to which an individual pays attention to work and replicates into
performance. An engagement model comes from the ‘burnout’ literature, which describes “job engagement as the positive antithesis of burnout, noting that burnout involves the erosion of engagement with one’s job” (Maslach et al 2001). According to Maslach et al, ‘six areas of work-life lead to either burnout or engagement: workload, control, rewards and recognition, community and social support, perceived fairness and values’. They argue that job engagement is related to all the six areas. Holbeche and Springett (2003) “high levels of engagement can only be achieved in workplaces where there is a shared sense of destiny and purpose that connects people at an emotional level and raises their personal aspirations”. According to Towers Perrin (2003), engagement never ends and it rests upon meaningful work and enriching work experience. It is not only about making people happy, or even paying them more money. It was found from his work that money and incentive plays a lesser role in engaging employees. The elements found significant for engagement were strong leadership, accountability, autonomy, a sense of control over one’s environment and opportunities for development. According to Saks (2006), a rationale approach for explaining employee engagement is found in social exchange theory (SET). SET argues that “obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence”. According to Cropanzano and Mitchell 2005, “basic principle of SET is that relationships evolve over time into trusting, loyal, and mutual commitments as long as the parties abide by certain ‘rules’ of exchange”. According to Seijts and Crim (2006) the 10 C’s of Employee Engagements are: Connect, Carrere, Clarity, Convey, Collaborate, Contribute, Control, Confidence, Credibility and Congratulate. The main purpose behind taking 10c’s of employee engagement as the base of the study is because there are several avenues of engaging an employee that head heart and hands. And those are conceptualized in 10c’s of employee engagement. By keeping those 10 c’s in mind we wanted to know whether these 10 C’s equally affect employee engagement of a faculty in a management institute or there is something else. Thus, in the field of study on engagement, the most familiar authors are- Barman, Arup (2007, 2006); G Basinsky (1990); Gratton. Lynda, Lind. Barbara, and Popper Walter (Jan,29-2004); Kahn, W. A. (1990); James Loehr, Ed.D., and Jack Groppel, (2002); Steve Bates ( Feb2004); Gen Tchow (2005); Richard Wellins (2002, 2005); Welbourne: Rude; Paul R. Baranthal (Nov, 2004); Robinson D., Perymen S., Hayday S.(Nov,2004); Derek Stockley (revised 7th July 2005); James Loehr,
Studies of Faculty Engagement

Seijts and Crim (2006), explored ‘what engages employee the most or the 10 C’s of employee engagement?’ and concluded with 10 C’s of employee engagement which mostly known as the generalized principal. They did not through light on faculty engagement. Similarly, Ewell (1997), studied on ‘organizing for learning: a new imperative’ came up with a conclusion that ‘if student learning needs to be improved than it is important to study institutional and faculty engagement practice which promote student learning’. Kuh, G.D (2001) assessed what really matters to student learning by focusing on quality of teaching, interaction with faculty and peer and involvement in course work. Marsh & Hattie, J 2002, examined the relationship between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Found that faculties’ college experience and student learning influence on teaching, and research. But, they did not define the role of faculty in colleges. Fairweather, J. (2002) in his essay ‘The mythologies of faculty productivity: implications for in-situational policies and decision making’ considered the nature of faculty work was shrouded in myth, opinions and conjectures. How to ensure faculty productivity is still a myth. Paul D. Umbach and Mathew R in their work ‘faculty do matters: the role of college faculty in student learning and
engagement’ and also examined the impact of faculty behavior and interaction on student learning. They talked about faculty behavior but not about faculty engagement.

**Research Gap and Importance of Study**

There are very limited numbers of research on faculty engagement. Over the period of time teaching and research has evolved as prime most responsibilities of the faculties. The common perception was that faculties who were highly involved in teaching engages the students that results in better learning. But, it is not so in reality. How does the faculty’s works motivates to see further in terms of performance is still a burning question or an un-answered question? How universities and colleges should engage the faculties to enhance the student learning process? All these require a fresh answer as well as standard model for further study.

**Objective:**

− The main objective of the study is to identify the factor which engages the faculties of management in colleges and institutions resulting in better performance of the students.

− To develop a model for faculty engagement based on the study conducted in Tripura state.

**Research methodology**

The overall methodology can be divided into three parts. The first part has been done to understand build the items of the scale which can be used to understand the faculty engagement factors. In the second part reliability of the scale used was tested. In the third part the factors responsible for faculty engagement were tried to understand.

In the first phase, eight focus group discussions were conducted among the professionals. Each group consisted of five members. They had been asked to discuss the 10 ‘C’ items, by assuming that all of them are important to engage faculties in management or institutions of business education. These focus group discussions were conducted among the faculty members from three management education institutions from Agartala. The results were concluded into 29 items (List of Items in Appendix).
In the second phase the results of the focus group discussions were taken as a structured questionnaire consisting of 29 items with five point Likert type scale, where ‘5’ represents ‘Highly agree’ and ‘1’ represents ‘Highly disagree’. Before conducting the final study the reliability of the scale has been tested using Cronbach’s Alpha Test. 25 faculties from two management institutions were considered for collecting the data. As the result (0.885) more than 0.6 it was supportive, i.e. the scale was reliable and ready for final survey (table -2).

In the third and final phase, 170 faculties filled questionnaires within which 150 were considered as valid. Respondents were selected by using non probability convenience sampling technique from five management and business education institutions. The total time taken for data collection was almost two months (November – December, 2010). An important issue was taken into account that the focus group respondents should not be same with the final study respondents. No repetition has been accepted. All the respondents were different in both the cases.

Data Analysis and findings

All the collected data were tabulated and analyzed with the help ‘SPSS’ version 15, a statistical software and Microsoft Excel, version 2007. The total analysis part was divided into two parts.

- (a) Final Reliability Check- After checking the reliability of the instrument at the time of pilot study, reliability was again calculated with the help of Cronbach’s Alpha test and found reliable as the value (0.814) was greater than 0.6 which is very reliable.

(Table 1: Reliability Statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result reveals new set of factors which explains the ways and means of faculty engagement. Total percentage of variance explained is 78.592% (Table-4, in Appendix) which is encouraging.
(b) Factor Identification Analysis

To identify the latent factors ‘Q’ type factor analysis was selected to deploy. Before, conducting the Q factor analysis, the researcher conducted KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) test to check whether the sample is adequate for conducting the factor analysis and thus found the value 0.7, with the result of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was also significant (table-2).

The factor analysis was done based on Eigen value greater than 1. Principal Component Axis Method and Varimax Rotation Procedure were used. As the result six factors were identified. Due to low factor loadings, i.e. less than 0.40 and some cross-loadings, 10 items out of 31, was dropped in a stepwise manner. 21 items factorized into six factors, without any cross-loading. Finally the total variance explained was 78.592 %. Only about 21.5 % was unexplained or can be explained through other variables which have not been considered in this study.

The factors were named based on the characteristics of the items grouped together under them. These new factors are 1) Appearance and assuring quality, 2) Empathy, 3) Additional facilities, 4) Industry interface and refreshment facilities, 5) Timely assistance and 6) Steadiness.

Table 4
Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged faculty will show a high sense of belongingness towards the profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty must be well connected with the mission vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging the faculties with the co curricular activities and organizing workshops and seminar will affect the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Engagement will result from smooth functioning of the communication channels which convey the right message at right time</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Job clarity</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>There must be some set of rules and regulations and guidelines to be followed by the faculty and students</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Engaging the faculties in developing better teaching aids and methodologies</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Faculty engagement in developing standard performance parameters of the students</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Implementation of the knowledge in the key result area imparting industry based learning</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Faculty must be well connected with the local market knowledge</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Controlling the outcome and not the process will result in better faculty engagement and performance</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Research department and student internship, thesis assignments should be connected with each other</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Proper link between faculties with research</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Engagement Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Reward will affect engagement of the faculties</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Appraisal based on performance, due recognition, in increase in responsibility will lead to better engagement.</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Networking with faculty will lead to better engagement</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Career orientation and student counseling forms a vital part of faculty engagement which affects students’ performance</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Proper guidance in internships forms a vital part of faculty engagement which affects students’ performance</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Monitoring certain performance standards will help assess the credibility of a faculty.</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Faculty should be very clear in what he or she intends to do</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Naming

To name the factors a panel of experts comprising of representatives of the focus groups were invited. The experts considered the contents those are loaded on factors. Thus, the identified factors based on the contents (in table-4) named the factors as follows –

- **Institutional attachment** (4 items)
- **Primary involvement** (5 items)
- **Secondary involvement** (5 items)
- **Recognition and networking** (3 items)
- **Career orientation and guidance** (2 items)
- **Credibility** (2 items)

The identified factors having the high possible influence on the faculty engagement in the business institutions can be shown as the figure-1.

Figure 1.
The Proposed Model or
Factors affecting Faculty Engagement

![Diagram of Faculty Engagement](image)

Contribution of the study

The study contributes to the body of knowledge with a new proposed model. This type of empirical study is first of its kind in the North East India for it’s based on the 10C, of employee engagement as the basis of the study. Focus group discussion among the faculties may contribute in developing deeper insights into the engagement aspects and its levels among faculty members. Later on the study further reveals
the principal factors those affecting faculty engagement. These identified factors emerged from 10 C’s of employee engagement may add a new dimension to the faculty engagement in the context of higher education.

**Limitations and Scope for Further Research**

This study was conducted only in one state i.e. in Tripura (Agartala). This study results based on the management educational institutions on Tripura State (India). By collecting more data from more institutes of other states of India in a larger way would make the model more robust in future. Not only management education institutions, other regular course institutions can also be included with proper modification of the data collection instruments. The model would be more robust, had it been after factor analysis a regression analysis conducted for exploration of factor impacts on faculty engagement. This can be the next step of our research.

**Conclusion**

From the analyses of this study it is clearly understandable that the study aims at a very qualitative and relative aspect of faculty (as an employee) engagement in the management education institutions. But it is obvious that this study has come to the result and landed on a new proposed model keeping in mind all the previous models and approaches to understand the very fact earlier. So researchers do not propose the model as the best one as the area is very relative, but still it can give us a relatively better option to understand the fact of better faculty engagement in future.
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**Appendices:**

**List of Items Selected by Focused Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career orientation and student counseling forms a vital part of faculty engagement which affects students' performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proper guidance in internships forms a vital part of faculty engagement which affects students' performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proper coordination between industry and faculty members of the colleges in guiding the students in thesis and internship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faculty must be well connected with the mission vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty must be well connected with the local market knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty must be well connected with the interest of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Engaged faculty will show a high sense of belongingness towards the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engaging the faculties with the co-curricular activities and organizing workshops and seminar will affect the students' performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Job clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty engagement in developing standard performance parameters for the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Engaging the faculties in developing better teaching aids and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Items Selected from Factor Analysis

**Institutional attachment:**

1. Engaged faculty will show a high sense of belongingness towards the profession
2. Faculty must be well connected with the mission vision
3. Engaging the faculties with the co-curricular activities and organizing workshops and seminar will affect the students performance organizational culture
Primary involvement:
1. Job clarity
2. Engagement will result from smooth functioning of the communication channels which convey the right message at right time
3. Developing teaching aids
4. Developing clear communication channels for students, teachers, and non teaching staffs
5. Setting of rules regulations and guidelines

Secondary involvement:
1. Connected with local market
2. Research and development
3. Linkage between faculties and students in research & development.
4. Imparting industry based learning
5. Control

Recognition and networking
1. Faculty appraisal
2. Networking with peers
3. Reward

Career orientation and guidance
1. Student counseling
2. Proper guidance in internship and thesis

Credibility
1. Clear intentions
2. Monitoring performance standards of the faculties

Table 2:
KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | 0.7 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 4557.370 |
| | df | 231 |
| | Sig. | .000 |
Table 3
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigen values</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>16.433</td>
<td>42.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>9.448</td>
<td>65.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>7.475</td>
<td>72.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>5.838</td>
<td>78.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>83.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>87.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>3.047</td>
<td>90.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>2.296</td>
<td>92.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>1.736</td>
<td>94.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>96.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>97.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>98.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>99.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>99.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>99.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>99.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>99.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>99.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.
Results of the factor analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Factors</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional attachment</td>
<td>18.398 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary involvement</td>
<td>16.689 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary involvement</td>
<td>14.681 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and networking</td>
<td>10.959 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career orientation and guidance</td>
<td>9.663 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>8.202 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.592 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of variance explained.