



## Asian Journal of Management and Commerce

E-ISSN: 2708-4523

P-ISSN: 2708-4515

AJMC 2023; 4(1): 26-33

© 2023 AJMC

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

Received: 24-10-2022

Accepted: 26-11-2022

**Dr. Prerna Chandel**

Assistant Professor,  
School of Management,  
Bahra University,  
Himachal Pradesh, India

# Examining the level of work engagement among women faculties in higher education institutes

**Dr. Prerna Chandel**

### Abstract

Women in the workplace have always carried a larger burden when balancing work and home responsibilities. The purpose to study is to examine the engagement levels of women faculty members in Higher Education Institutions of India. The study adopts a cross-sectional survey design with a sample of 360 women faculty members employed in Higher Education Institutions. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire. Majority of the women faculty members were often engaged, which shows they were engaged only once in a week while discharging their duty. While only few employees were found to be engaged in their work. The study cites a major concern for Higher Education Institutions. Present study will help institutional academic bodies to bring reform in their HR Policy and to be focused on their institution specific factors that influence and contribute to restore the disengaged women faculties. Several studies on employee work engagement have been done in the corporate sector and a need was felt to explore education sector specific engagement levels prevailing to women faculties. The outcomes of the study will create a valuable relationship between women faculty and institution, which will encourage faculties to go extra mile for their institution.

**Keywords:** Women faculty engagement, disengagement, higher education institutions

### Introduction

Success stories of prospering institutions have been scripted on efforts made by their engaged employees. William A. Kahn (1990) <sup>[12]</sup> who is considered as the founding father of employee engagement movement defines it as “harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement people employee and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances”. By this Kahn implied that an employee has to be present both physically and psychologically while performing their job role in the organization. Employee work engagement is the attachment employee feel towards their work that results in higher levels of performance, commitment and loyalty (Patro, 2013) <sup>[30]</sup>. Another conceptualization of engagement includes the “psychological components of dedication, absorption, and vigor” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) <sup>[23]</sup>. Work engagement is the assumed opposite of burnout. Burnout, however, is a reaction to chronic job stress and is characterized by exhaustion, disengagement, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment. Exhaustion, generally considered the primary component of burnout, refers to emotional, physical, and cognitive strain and fatigue that result from long-term exposure to work demands (Maslach & Leiter, 1997) <sup>[14]</sup>. Contrary to those who suffer from burnout, engaged employees have a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work activities and they see themselves as able to deal well with the demands of their job (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2009) <sup>[24]</sup>.

Gallup recently surveyed more than 7,500 full-time employees about burnout. 23 percent of those workers said they felt burned out more often than not. An additional 44 percent reported feeling burned out sometimes. To put that into context, nearly two-thirds of full-time workers are dealing with burnout at some point while at work. According to Clokify, in 2019, a high percentage of people experiencing burnout, 7 out of 10 people have had contact with burnout. 5 out of 10 felt stress and have experienced burnout. The job burnout rate has grown in alarming numbers among men and women, although women are more prone than men. Several studies suggest that the incidences of burnout among women are greater because of differences in job conditions. The most sobering study was conducted in 2018 by Montreal University researchers, who followed 2,026 workers for four years, detailing their emotional exhaustion, cynicism and professional effectiveness.

**Corresponding Author:**

**Dr. Prerna Chandel**

Assistant Professor,  
School of Management,  
Bahra University,  
Himachal Pradesh, India

The results, published in *Annals of Work Exposures and Health*, revealed that women were more vulnerable to burnout than men because women tended to have less authority and were less likely to call the shots which can lead to increased frustration and stress and diminished well-being. Women in the workplace have always carried a larger burden when balancing work and home responsibilities. Working mothers have always worked a “double shift” a full day of work, followed by hours spent caring for children and doing household labor.

Employee work engagement is majorly explored area in the corporate world while in the educational sector, it has limited studies (Robinson *et al.*, 2004) <sup>[31]</sup>. Institutions with engaged staff tend to have higher employee wellbeing, and lower turnover and sickness absence. Particularly higher education institutions, having engaged and motivated staff was seen as crucial in delivering high quality teaching and learning (Hagner and Schneebeck, 2000) <sup>[32]</sup>. According to the Cornerstone on Demand and Ellucian report 47.1 percent of institutions do not measure and track engagement levels. Those that do are using tools such as engagement surveys (29 percent), employee reviews (27 percent), student surveys (16 percent) and employee retention data (15.3 percent). According to Maslach and Goldberg (1998) <sup>[33]</sup>, teachers’ behavior, students’ outcome, and as a result, the whole educational system can be affected negatively by burnout.

India’s higher education system ranks third to China and USA in terms of number of students enrolled according to the World Bank. In Indian context, the number of such studies is really scanty. According to statistics of The Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) World University Rankings for the year 2019 reported that only three Indian Universities could feature in the list of world’s top 200 Universities. One of the key factors driving the quality of education is teacher’s emotional and intellectual engagement in their work. The construct of Faculty engagement is in its infancy stage and on global level researchers are trying to explore the literature on the level of faculty engagement according to different demographics. Keeping this research gap in view present study aims to analyze the work engagement among female faculties of higher education institutions of India.

### Review of Literature

Acker (1990) <sup>[34]</sup> pointed out that job evaluations as an organizational process are not gender-neutral, but rather gendered processes which serve to produce gender inequality. Job evaluation systems evaluate jobs, rather than their incumbents, based on a set of characteristics such as complexity, responsibility, and skills. These evaluations are used to set wages and ranks of jobs in organizations. Job evaluations are based on managerial values and beliefs that traditionally privilege men’s skills and positions over those of women. For example, a task done by a man boss is regarded as skilled, while when that task is done by a woman secretary it may be regarded as unskilled and less valued.

Tang and Talpade (1999) <sup>[47]</sup> tried to probe the gender differences among faculty and non-faculty members in terms of their job satisfaction at a public university in South-eastern USA; they found that money remains a factor of satisfaction for males and fulfilment of social needs for female employees.

Kanter (1997) <sup>[35]</sup> one of the reasons women are under-represented in high positions is their lack of access to the informal and formal interactions and communications

Britton (2003) <sup>[36]</sup> Jobs at the bottom of the organizational ladder (disproportionately filled by women) are assumed to be least difficult, least responsible positions” Jobs at the bottom of the organizational ladder (disproportionately filled by women) are assumed to be least difficult, least responsible positions. Domestic responsibilities may make women less likely to pursue avenue for upward mobility Domestic responsibilities may make women less likely to pursue avenue for upward mobility.

Bakker *et al.* (2008) <sup>[2]</sup> study among female school principals found that those with most personal resources scored highest on work engagement

Acker (2006) <sup>[37]</sup> interactions in the workplace disadvantage women and produce gender inequalities. Women and men in organizations go about their everyday work carrying with them gender-based assumptions about those with whom they interact. These assumptions may influence formal interactions (e.g., not listening to women in meetings), or informal interactions (e.g., not inviting women for a drink after work)

Crompton *et al.* (2007) <sup>[38]</sup> men and women’s experiences in the workplace and at home may influence women’s capacity to be fully available and engaged in work and men’s capacity to be available and engaged at home. As a result, and because the majority of individuals who are responsible for taking care of their families are women, their availability for work may be limited.

Konrad *et al.* (2000) <sup>[39]</sup> A meta-analysis was conducted on gender differences and job attribute preferences confirmed that men show an increased preference for earnings relative to women

Carli and Eagly (2001) <sup>[40]</sup> Women in their interactions are found to be less influential than men, this is mainly because of two reasons. First, to be effective, it is important to be perceived as competent, and people usually perceive men to have higher competence than women have. These perceptions create gender differences in social influence that may not be based on objective differences in behaviour or performance of women and men. Second, men usually have greater power than women do, and they often resist women’s influence because they consider women’s influence as a threat to their power advantage

Aaltio-Marjosola and Mills (2002) <sup>[41]</sup> feminine and masculine genders consist of the values and ideals that originate from culture.

Nadeem, *et al.* (2011) <sup>[42]</sup> In educational institutions social and economic conditions of teachers have an effect on their performance i.e., low salary., lack of facilities, status of teachers in society, teacher’s mental health and morale, stress of work, relation with staff and head teachers, working environment are all those factors that have an strong impact on females teachers performance

Martin (2000) <sup>[43]</sup> Ignoring gender in organizational research and theory contribute to the perpetuation of inequalities in the workplace

Alvesson and Billing (2009) <sup>[44]</sup> The major components of the gender system are masculinity and femininity which refer to varied experiences, values, and meanings of individuals, organizations and societies (i.e., achievement vs nurturing orientations)

Shantz *et al.* (2010) <sup>[45]</sup> highly engaged women with young children experience high level of burnout

United Nations (2010) working women spend a great amount of time on the double burden of paid work and family responsibilities, and when considering the unpaid work, women's total work hours are much longer than men's in all regions of the world

Ashcraft (2013) <sup>[46]</sup> gave a "glass slipper" metaphor to indicate how occupations that may appear to naturally possess features that fit certain people more than others.

### Objectives of the study and hypothesis

To explore the employee work engagement challenges faced by women faculties in higher education institutions the study aims at following research objectives:

- To measure the level of engagement amongst the women faculty members working in Indian Higher Education Institutions of Himachal Pradesh.
- To analyse the relationship between the level of engagement amongst the women faculty members and demographic variables and institutional variables.

### To fulfil the above specified objectives, the following hypotheses were framed

**H01:** There is no significant difference between engagement of women faculty members and demographic variables (age, marital status, educational qualification, income, length of marriage, parental status, number of children and total work experience).

**H02:** There is no significant difference between engagement of women faculty members and institutional variables (type of institution, job category, working place, designation, work area / discipline and work experience in present institution).

### Research methodology

#### Sample for the study

The study conducted was cross-sectional descriptive in nature. As per the geographical scope of the study, Himachal Pradesh is a hill station comprising of 12 districts out of which for the study 3 districts namely, Shimla, Solan and Kangra were selected as they comprised of maximum representation of higher education institutions and faculty members in their region. A multi stage sampling technique was undertaken for drawing a proportional number of women faculty members from both government and private higher education institutions in the Himachal Pradesh, India. The optimal sample size was restricted to 357 participants. So, nearly 500 questionnaires were distributed to the targeted faculty members out of which 367 were returned, yielding a response rate of 73%. Due to the reasons of incompleteness and irrelevance 7 questionnaires were rejected. Finally, 360 questionnaires (117 from Government institutions and 243 from Private institutions) were utilized for the analysis of the study.

A complete list of selected Higher Education Institutions to be approached was prepared. Permission was sought and obtained from the authorities of each institution. Data collection was done through personal visits and provided questionnaires to the female respondents in their institutions in order to enhance a high response rate and the anonymity of their responses was assured. A web link was also developed for online data collection.

### Research instruments

The structured questionnaire used in the present study consisted of two sections. Section I comprised of the statements relating to the level of employee engagement using Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) <sup>[22]</sup> Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) employee engagement scale. A shortened nine-item version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was used. It consists of three subscales, namely vigor, dedication and absorption. The response was sought on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 indicating "never" to 6 indicating "always or everyday". Section II relates to demographic and institutional profile of the respondents. Demographic variables: age, marital status, educational qualification, income, length of marriage, parental status, number of children and total work experience.; Institutional variables: type of institution, job category, working place (native or non-native), designation, work area / discipline and work experience in present institution.

Post data collection, coding and data entry was done. After tabulation of data the statistical tools and techniques used for the study included descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviation; one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique.

### Results and Discussion

#### Measurement of the level of engagement of Women faculty members employed in higher education institutions of Himachal Pradesh

The first objective of the study was to measure the level of engagement of women faculty members working in Higher Education Institutions of Himachal Pradesh. To serve this objective a nine-item shortened version of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by Wilmar Schaufeli and Arnold Bakker in 2004 <sup>[22]</sup> was used. They defined "Engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption". Therefore, employee engagement constitutes three dimensions of engagement: *vigor*, *dedication*, and *absorption*. Schaufeli and Bakker defined these three dimensions as below:

- **Vigor:** Refers to high levels of energy and resilience, the willingness to invest effort, not being easily fatigued, and persistence in the face of difficulties
- **Dedication:** Refers to deriving a sense of significance from one's work, feeling enthusiastic and proud about one's job, and feeling inspired and challenged by it.
- **Absorption:** Refers to being totally and happily immersed in one's work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it so that time passes quickly and one forgets everything else that is around.

The faculty members were asked to indicate their level of feeling for three engagement dimensions which consists of various statements on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 6 where '0' indicates 'never engaged' and '6' stands for 'always or everyday engaged'. The scale was found to be a reliable measure of engagement of women faculty members in the higher education institution of Himachal Pradesh as Cronbach's alpha for each subscale; vigor (0.71), dedication (0.80) and absorption (0.76) and the composite reliability of the construct was 0.88 which is greater than the acceptable limit of 0.70 (Hair *et al.*, 2009) <sup>[8]</sup>.

To gauge the response of women faculty members on each of the three dimensions of UWES engagement scale, descriptive statistics was calculated which is given below in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics of the dimensions of Women Faculty Engagement in Higher Education Institutions of Himachal Pradesh, India

Dimension	Mean	S.D.
Vigor	4.18	1.04
Dedication	4.59	1.14
Absorption	4.05	1.01

The descriptive statistics of women faculty engagement presented in Table 1 highlighted that with a minor difference in mean score of vigor, dedication and absorption, the dedication dimension shows the slightly high mean score of 4.59 followed by vigor (4.18) and absorption (4.05). As per Wilmar Schaufeli (2004)<sup>[22]</sup> employees who score high on dedication can strongly identify with their work because it is experienced as meaningful, inspiring, and challenging. Besides, they usually feel enthusiastic and proud about their work. From this it can be inferred that women faculty members at Higher education institutions of Himachal Pradesh are proud of their work and profession as they largely contribute in the character building and development of the student, society and the nation. Next, on the basis of summated scores, Table 2 will indicate the overall level of faculty engagement while discharging their duties in Higher Education Institutions of Himachal Pradesh, India.

**Table 2:** Level of Engagement of Women Faculty members in Higher Education Institutions of Himachal Pradesh, India

Response	N	Percentage
Not at All Engaged	17	4.72
Almost never Engaged	8	2.22
Rarely Engaged	20	5.55
Sometimes Engaged	71	19.72
Often Engaged	123	34.16
Very often Engaged	106	29.44
Highly Engaged	15	4.16
Total	360	100
Mean Score	38.46	
S.D.	10.59	
Result	Often Engaged	

Table 2 presented above indicated the overall engagement level which indicated that the one fourth of women faculty members (N=123, Percentage=34.16) were found to be often engaged in their work. As per Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) employees who are often engaged are those employees who are engaged only once in a week. Additionally, it was also observed that only 4.16% faculties (N=15) were highly engaged. This figure cites a major concern for the higher education institutions of Himachal Pradesh. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a scope and need for enhancing the engagement levels of women faculty members of HEI's of Himachal Pradesh. According to Joseph Regy and Malini (2017)<sup>[18]</sup> in order to be successful an institution must know what makes its women faculties happy and engaged and what they want and how to retain them. Every educational institution should examine the factors which contributes in improving the

engagement levels of their women faculty members.

**Analyzing the relationship between the level of engagement amongst the women faculty members and demographic variables**

To achieve the second objective and test its formulated hypothesis present study investigated the difference in female employee work engagement levels on the basis of demographic variables like Age, Marital Status, Educational Qualification and Income, length of marriage, parental status, number of children, total work experience. Study had Women Faculty Engagement as dependent variable and demographic variables as independent variable. The hypothesis was analyzed and tested by employing one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test and presented in Table 3.

**Table 3:** ANOVA to measure significant difference in engagement of faculty members with respect to demographic variables

Demographic Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	F-value	*P-value
<b>Age</b>					
Up to 25 Years	13	35.31	5.36	1.403	0.232
26 to 35 Years	172	38.08	10.98		
36 to 45 Years	95	42.11	6.04		
46 to 55 Years	61	37.25	12.09		
More than 55 Years	19	39.63	9.91		
<b>Marital Status</b>					
Married	211	38.86	10.06	0.647	0.524
Unmarried	113	37.77	11.61		
Divorced	7	33.50	11.50		
Widowed	29	35.10	8.77		
<b>Educational Qualification</b>					
Graduate	7	36.06	10.77	4.047	0.003
Postgraduate	124	40.29	5.88		
M. Phil	23	35.48	14.74		
Doctorate	179	42.78	5.89		
Post Doctorate	27	39.78	10.14		
<b>Income</b>					
Upto Rs. 30,000	128	38.80	8.61	2.644	0.023
Rs. 30,001 to 50,000	93	37.83	12.92		
Rs. 50,001 to 70,000	49	38.37	8.63		
Rs. 70,001 to 90,000	18	41.83	8.97		
Rs. 90,001 to 1,10,000	36	33.86	14.06		
More than Rs. 1,10,000	36	41.92	7.84		
<b>Length of Marriage</b>					
5 Years or less	79	40.08	10.02	5.291	0.370
6 to 10 Years	89	39.50	9.87		
11 to 15 Years	74	39.02	9.75		
16 to 20 Years	69	38.15	9.53		
More than 20 Years	49	37.17	9.29		
<b>Parental status</b>					
Children	227	37.64	11.47	1.922	0.045
No Children	133	39.86	8.74		
<b>Number of children</b>					
1	79	37.89	9.47	2.700	0.010
2	127	37.01	9.25		
3	22	35	8.75		
4	5	33.75	8.43		
More than 4	0	0.00	0.00		
<b>Total work experience</b>					
Upto 5 Years	111	40.93	7.61	0.225	0.799
6 to 10 Years	100	36.07	12.36		
11 to 15 Years	58	38.09	10.95		
16 to 20 Years	50	37.34	12.91		
More than 20 Years	41	39.51	7.66		

\*Level of significance 5%

**Work engagement of women faculty members and age**

Women faculty members in the present study were of different age groups, ranging from 25 years to more than 55 years of age. Majority of the women faculties were millennial employees (N=172). Mean scores revealed that faculty members in age group bracket of 36 to 45 years were highly engaged (mean= 42.11) followed by faculty members who were more than 55 years of age (mean= 39.63) and 26 to 35 years (mean= 38.08) were often engaged. Whereas employees' upto 25 years of age were not at all engaged (mean= 35.31). Further following the hypothesis test at 5% level of significance the value of F-ratio (1.403) had no significant difference (p-value= 0.232;  $p>0.05$ ) in the engagement level of women faculties with respect to their age group. Thus, it can be concluded that engagement level of women faculty does not differ across age groups.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and marital status**

Work engagement of faculty was also measured on the basis of marital status: married, unmarried, divorced and widowed women. Data illustrated that among the three marital status, married faculty members (mean= 38.86) showed higher level of engagement in their work followed by unmarried (mean= 37.77) and divorcee (mean= 35.50). At 5% level of significance results indicated F-Ratio (0.647) was not significant (p-value= 0.524;  $p>0.05$ ) which concluded that employee engagement does not vary with marital status.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and educational qualification**

Work engagement level of women faculty members was analysed on the basis of different educational qualification like Graduate, Post- Graduate, M.Phil, Doctorate and Post Doctorate. Among these women faculty members holding doctorate degree were highly engaged (mean= 42.78) while employees holding postgraduate degree are often engaged (mean= 40.29). Additionally, it was found that at 5% level of significance, the value of F-statistic (4.047) was significant (p-value=0.003;  $p<0.05$ ) which proved the existence of significant difference in the level of women faculty engagement with respect to their educational qualification.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and income**

There were six income brackets in the study. Women employees earning a monthly income of more than Rs. 1,10,000 (mean score= 41.92) followed by Rs. 70,001 to 90,000 (mean= 41.83) showed high engagement levels while the women employees getting monthly income of Rs. 90,001 to 1,10,000 (mean= 33.86) were not at all engaged. Further it was found that at 5% level of significance, the value of F-statistic (2.644) was significant which proved the existence of significant difference (p-value= 0.023;  $p<0.05$ ) in the level of engagement of women faculty members with respect to their educational qualification.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and length of marriage**

Length of marriage of women faculty member ranged from 5 years to more than 20 years. It could be derived from the

results that women faculties who had upto 5 years of marriage were found to be highly engaged in their work (mean= 40.08) followed by women faculty members who had 6 to 10 Years of marriage (mean= 39.50) while those with above 20 years of marriage were least engaged (mean= 37.17). However, results in table 1 indicated that at 5% level of significance, the value of F-statistic (0.529) was not significant (p-value= 0.370;  $p>0.05$ ) which proved no significant difference exists in the engagement level of women faculty members and their length of marriage.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and parental status**

Work engagement of women faculty was also measured on the basis of parental status: women with children and women with no children. Data illustrated that faculty members with no children (mean= 38.86) display higher level of engagement in their work in comparison with women faculties with children (mean= 37.64). At 5% level of significance results indicated F-Ratio (1.922) was significant (p-value= 0.045;  $p<0.05$ ) which concluded that employee engagement varies with parental status.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and number of children**

It could be derived from the results that women faculties having 1 child found to be highly engaged in their work (mean= 37.89). At 5% level of significance results indicated F-Ratio (2.700) was significant (p-value= 0.010;  $p<0.05$ ) which concluded that employee engagement varies with number of children.

**Work engagement of women faculty members and total work experience**

Total work experience of women faculty member ranged from 5 years to more than 20 years. It could be derived from the results that women faculties with total work experience of upto 5 years were highly engaged in their work (mean= 40.93) followed by women faculty members who have more than 20 years of total work experience (mean= 39.51) while those with experience of 6 to 10 years were least engaged (mean= 36.07). At 5% level of significance, the value of F-statistic (0.225) was not significant (p-value= 0.799;  $p>0.05$ ) which proved no significant difference exists in the engagement level of women faculty members with respect to their total work experience.

**Analyzing the relationship between the level of engagement amongst the women faculty members and institutional variables**

To achieve this objective and test its formulated hypothesis present study investigated the difference in women employee engagement levels on the basis of institutional variables: Type of institution, Job category, Working place (native or non-native), Designation, Work area / discipline and Work experience in present institution. Study had Women faculty engagement as dependent variable and institutional variables as independent variable. The hypothesis was analyzed and tested by employing one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test and presented in Table 4.

**Table 4:** ANOVA to measure significant difference in engagement of women faculty members with respect to institutional variables

Institutional Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	F-value	*P-value
<b>Type of Institution</b>					
Government	117	39.21	10.48	1.93	0.045
Private	243	36.91	10.69		
<b>Job category</b>					
Full-time	277	37.19	9.29	3.171	0.000
Part-time	83	35.75	8.93		
<b>Working in Native Place</b>					
Native Place	302	38.75	11.07	1.201	0.237
Other Than Native Place	58	36.93	7.47		
<b>Designation</b>					
Professor	65	37.72	11.92	3.111	0.015
Associate Professor	49	38.98	8.31		
Assistant Professor	246	38.55	10.65		
<b>Discipline/work area</b>					
Commerce and Business Management	129	38	9.5	2.871	0.011
Education and Humanities	61	39.47	9.86		
Science	73	37.67	9.41		
Engineering and Technology	97	37.03	9.25		
<b>Work Experience in present institution</b>					
Upto 5 Years	161	40.08	10.32	2.576	0.049
6 to 10 Years	121	39.20	11.13		
11 to 15 Years	39	39.00	10.36		
16 to 20 Years	39	38.15	11.82		
More than 20 Years	0	0.00	0.00		

\*Level of significance 5%

### Work engagement of women faculty members and the type of institution

Higher Education Institutions were categorized into government institution and private institution. To study whether engagement of women faculty members differs significantly across these two types of institutions hypothesis was formulated. It was observed that women faculty members employed in government institutions have slightly higher engagement level (mean= 39.21) as compared to private institutions (mean= 36.91). Following the hypothesis test at 5% level of significance the f-value (1.93) was found significant (p-value= 0.045;  $p < 0.05$ ) which led to the rejection of null hypothesis and which proved that there was a significant difference across the type of institutions.

H010: There is no significant difference between engagement of women faculty members and job category. It could be derived from the results that women faculties who were doing full-time teaching job were found more engaged in their work (mean= 37.89) in comparison to those faculties who were part-time teachers. At 5% level of significance results indicated F-Ratio (3.171) was significant (p-value= 0.000;  $p < 0.05$ ) which concluded that employee engagement varies with job category.

### Work engagement of women faculty members and working place

Women faculty members working area comprised of native place and non-native place. Few women faculties were working in their native place and few were away from their native place (non-native place). It could be observed that engagement level of women faculty members working in native place (mean= 38.75) had a slight difference when compared to women faculties working in non-native place (mean= 36.93). However, at 5% level of significance the f-value (1.202) was not significant (p-value= 0.23;  $p > 0.05$ ) which led to the acceptance of null hypothesis. This proved

that no significant difference was found in the engagement level of women faculty members working in native place or at non-native place

### Work engagement of women faculty members and designation

Higher Education Institutions in India comprise of three academic ranks: Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor. In the study a minor difference was found in the engagement levels of faculties, where associate professors (mean= 38.98) were more engaged in their work while professors (mean= 37.72) and assistant professors (mean= 38.55) were slightly less engaged in comparison to associate professors. Further, for hypothesis testing at 5% level of significance, the value of F-statistic (3.111) was found significant (p-value= 0.015;  $p < 0.05$ ) which proved that there was a significant difference in engagement levels of women faculty members with respect to their designations. The findings may be viewed in the light of Job Demands and Resources Model of Work Engagement proposed by Bakker and Demerouti (2008) <sup>[2]</sup>, stating that employee engagement is determined by job resources and personal resources independently or in combination and they become instrumental, particularly when job demands are high. In the initial stages of teaching career as Assistant Professor, job demands are high in terms of teaching work load, requirement to upgrade qualification, participating in committee work and leading students in co-curricular and extension activities whereas Professors are on senior rank and have attained a higher credentials and satisfaction in careers. And Associate Professors are well versed and settled in the profession and look for opportunities to steadily grow in career path.

### Work engagement of women faculty members and work area / discipline

To study whether work engagement varies significantly

across women faculty work areas or disciplines. The mean score of work engagement across the four faculty work areas namely Commerce and Business Management, Science, Engineering and Technology and Education and Humanities were analyzed and faculties serving in Education and Humanities attributed higher work engagement levels (mean= 39.47) in comparison to other disciplines. A large number of faculty members in this category possessed formal qualification as Teacher Educators i.e. B.Ed and M.Ed degree. Providing formal training to faculty members of all disciplines regarding curriculum design, teaching techniques, evaluation techniques, student handling and other aspects could be contributory in enhancing their work engagement. At 5% level of significance results indicated F-Ratio (2.871) was significant ( $p$ -value= 0.011;  $p < 0.05$ ) which concluded that employee engagement varies with work area / discipline.

### Work engagement of women faculty members and work experience in present institution

Work experience in present institution ranged from 5 years to more than 20 years. It could be derived from the results that women faculties with work experience of upto 5 years were highly engaged in their work (mean= 40.08) followed by faculty members with 6 to 10 years of work experience (mean= 39.20). At 5% level of significance, the value of F-statistic (2.576) was not significant ( $p$ -value= 0.049;  $p < 0.05$ ) which proved no significant difference exists in the engagement level of women faculty members with respect to their work experience.

### Conclusions

The study was presented in the light of the challenges faced by women faculties in higher education system. Study reported moderate levels of engagement amongst the women faculty members of higher education institutions. There is a need for enhancing the engagement levels of female teachers since institutions cannot afford to have teachers who are not fully engaged in the learning process and yet expect them to deliver quality education. Institution must acknowledge the need to provide an environment in which female employees perceive their work to be meaningful and themselves to be empowered to contribute towards organizational and societal goals. Women in the workplace have always carried a larger burden when balancing work and home responsibilities. This has caused huge burnout among the faculty members which is resulting in disengagement. To overcome prevailing challenges, it was found essential to continuously investigate the status of engagement amongst women faculty members.

### References

1. Association of Colleges Survey. International Activity in Colleges; c2018. available at: <https://www.aoc.co.uk/about-colleges/research-and-stats/surveys-and-research/aoc-surveys> (accessed 13 November 2018).
2. Bakker AB, Demerouti E. Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*. 2008;13:209-223.
3. Frank FD, Finnegan RP, Taylor CR. The race for talent: retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century. *Human Resource Planning*. 2004;27(3):12-25.
4. Gallup. The Engaged University. Gallup Higher Education Employee Engagement; c2017.
5. Giang. Burnout quick stats – 3 things to continue in 2020. Thrive Global; c2019.
6. Goffman E. Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co; c1961a.
7. Goffman E. Asylums. New York: Doubleday Anchor; c1961b.
8. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice Hall; c2009.
9. Himachal Pradesh General Studies, Census of Himachal Pradesh; c2011. available at: <https://hpgeneralstudies.com/census-himachal-pradesh-2011> (accessed on 3 November 2018),
10. Janetius ST. Engaged Employees in Institutes of Higher Education. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 2016;4(11):308-312.
11. Jonaki B, Prasenjit P. Higher Education in India: Recent Issues and Trends. *Research Journal of Educational Sciences*. 2016;4(1):10-16.
12. Kahn WA. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1990;33:692-724.
13. Maria WA. Faculty and the engaged institution: toward understanding motivators and deterrents for fostering engagement. Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University; c2008.
14. Maslach C, Leiter MP. The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; c1997.
15. Monica S. Study Makes the Case for Employee Engagement in Higher Education Institutions. *Cornerstone on Demand and Ellucian survey*; c2016.
16. Newcombe T. Employee engagement a challenge in higher education, research finds. *Software provider Midland HR*; c2013.
17. Quinn M, Smith PM. Gender, Work, and Health. *Annals of Work Exposures and Health*. 2018;62(4):389-392. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annweh/wxy019>
18. Regy J, Malini D. Employee Engagement of faculties in selected higher educational Institutes in South India. *IJARIIIE*, 2017, 3(1).
19. Rothbard NP. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2001;46:655-684.
20. Rowley J. Motivation and academic staff in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 1996;4(3):11-16.
21. Saks AM. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2006;21(7):600-619.
22. Schaufeli W, Bakker A. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) preliminary manual (Version 1.1, December 2004). Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University; c2004.
23. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). Utrecht, The Netherlands: Occupational Health Psychology Unit, University of Utrecht; c2003.
24. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB, Van Rhenen W. How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2009;30:893-917. doi:10.1002/job.595
25. Schaufeli WB, Salanova M, Gonzalez-Roma V, Bakker

- AB. The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 2002;3:71-92.
26. Stevensin M. Employee Burnout Statistics You Need to Know. HR Exchange Network; c2020.
  27. Truss C, Soane E, Edwards C, Wisdom K, Croll A, Burnett J. *Working Life: Employee Attitudes and Engagement 2006*. London, CIPD; c2006.
  28. UNESCO, UIS Tellmaps, tellmaps.com. (Accessed on May 11 2019); c2018.
  29. World Bank. *India Country Summary of Higher Education*; c2010. Retrieved from [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1121703274255/14392641193249163062/India\\_CountrySummary.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1121703274255/14392641193249163062/India_CountrySummary.pdf) (accessed on 27 July 2018).
  30. Patro DK, Qi M, Sun X. A simple indicator of systemic risk. *Journal of Financial Stability*. 2013 Apr 1;9(1):105-16.
  31. Robinson TE, Kolb B. Structural plasticity associated with exposure to drugs of abuse. *Neuropharmacology*. 2004 Jan 1;47:33-46.
  32. Hagner PR. Schneebeck (2001). *Engaging the faculty*. Barone, CA, & Hagner, 2000, 1(3).
  33. Maslach C, Goldberg J. Prevention of burnout: New perspectives. *Applied and preventive psychology*. 1998 Dec 1;7(1):63-74.
  34. Acker J. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & society*. 1990 Jun;4(2):139-58.
  35. Kanter DS, Mikkola KM, Patel SR, Parker JA, Goldhaber SZ. Thrombolytic therapy for pulmonary embolism: frequency of intracranial hemorrhage and associated risk factors. *Chest*. 1997 May 1;111(5):1241-5.
  36. Britton NF, Britton NF. *Essential mathematical biology*. London: Springer; c2003 Apr.
  37. Acker J. Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & society*. 2006 Aug;20(4):441-64.
  38. Crompton KE, Goud JD, Bellamkonda RV, Gengenbach TR, Finkelstein DI, Horne MK, *et al*. Polylysine-functionalised thermoresponsive chitosan hydrogel for neural tissue engineering. *Biomaterials*. 2007 Jan 1;28(3):441-449.
  39. Konrad AM, Ritchie Jr JE, Lieb P, Corrigall E. Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*. 2000 Jul;126(4):593.
  40. Carli LL, Eagly AH. Gender, hierarchy, and leadership: An introduction. *Journal of Social issues*. 2001;57(4):629-36.
  41. Aaltio-Marjosola I, Mills AJ, Mills JH. Special Issue of *Culture and Organization*; c2002.
  42. Nadeem M. A study on occupational stress experienced by private and public banks employees in Quetta City. *African journal of business management*. 2011 Apr 18;5(8):3063-3070.
  43. Martin DJ, Garske JP, Davis MK. Relation of the therapeutic alliance with outcome and other variables: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. 2000 Jun;68(3):438.
  44. Alvesson M, Billing YD. *Understanding gender and organizations*. Sage; 2009 May 7.
  45. Shantz NC, Chang RW, Slowik JG, Vlasenko A, Abbatt JP, Leaitch WR. Slower CCN growth kinetics of anthropogenic aerosol compared to biogenic aerosol observed at a rural site. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*. 2010 Jan 15;10(1):299-312.
  46. Ashcraft KL. The glass slipper: "Incorporating" occupational identity in management studies. *Academy of management review*. 2013 Jan;38(1):6-31.
  47. Tang TL, Talpade M. Sex differences in satisfaction with pay and co-workers: Faculty and staff at a public institution of higher education. *Public Personnel Management*. 1999 Sep;28(3):345-349.