Perception on faculty academic relationship management in higher education with reference to self financing engineering colleges
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Abstract

The study aims to find out the faculty perceptions in higher education towards academic relationship management. The researcher selected 363 respondents by convenience sampling technique among the faculty members working in engineering colleges in the district of Chennai, Kanchipuram and Thiruvallur districts of Tamilnadu for this study. This study is to find out the perceptional difference in relationship management due to demographic factors–gender, age, designation and marital status and contributing factors- team work, Job stress and work environment. The study revealed that major faculty members perceive work environment, teamwork, leadership, career growth are the key dimensions that influence on relationship management if these dimensions are perceived positively. Moreover, job stress has a negative impact on the perception of faculty academic relationship by the faculty members.
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1. Introduction

The success of any college or university depends in large part on the effectiveness of its teaching community. As the front line in delivering quality education, faculty members are a key determinant in whether or not an institution lives up to the needs and expectations of its students. Accordingly, faculty members need to feel that they’re an essential, integrated element in the institution at which they work. Faculty members are the major assets of an institution. It is essential that the faculty perform together as a collective unit and contribute equally towards the realization of a common goal. Employees must be comfortable with each other to deliver their best and enjoy their work. Faulty relationship management is a process that colleges use to effectively manage all interactions with faculty, ultimately to achieve the goals of the institution. The leadership or top management can play a critical role in this process, both in terms of training and coaching faculty members on how to effectively establish and nurture relationships with employees and in measuring and monitoring those relationships to determine whether objectives are being met. The more open institutions can be, the more likely they are to establish strong relationships that lead to increased loyalty and productivity among employees and decreased turnover and dissatisfaction. Ultimately, faculty academic relationship requires the same skills and processes required to manage any relationship; a clear understanding of faculty needs and a desire to meet those needs is foundational. Then steps must be taken to interact effectively with faculty through a variety of communication channels, both interpersonal and formal. Finally, measurement of the effectiveness of these efforts should be frequent and ongoing, with improvements and adjustments made when results are not showing continual improvement or satisfactory levels of performance.

2. Need for study

Understanding the faculty academic relationship is important because it plays a vital role in the growth and success of an institution. Conducive environment makes the staff to impart more effort towards their daily work. As the engineering colleges expand in terms of additional courses and departments it is necessary to analyze the perception of its members in the existing system for future developments.

3. Objectives of the study

- To understand the faculty perception towards relationship management.
- To analyze the impact of demographic variables on relationship management.
- To know and analyse the view of faculty towards work environment, team work and job stress, leadership and career growth.
4. Conceptual framework

5. Research methodology

The research design followed in this study is descriptive research design. The faculty members working in engineering colleges in Chennai, Kancheepuram and Thiruvallur districts forms the population. A convenience sample of 363 faculty members was taken for collection of data. The primary data were collected from the faculty members through structured questionnaire method. The gathered data was analyzed through statistical software SPSS.

6. Analysis and discussion

6.1. Faculty age versus perception of faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty age and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between faculty age and perception of faculty academic relationship

Table 6.1: Faculty Age versus Perception of Faculty Academic Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age *.faculty academic relationship</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>18.758</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>20.994</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>4.689</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation: The sig (p) value is greater than .05. Hence accept Null hypothesis. There is no difference between faculty age and perception of faculty academic relationship.

6.2. Faculty gender versus perception of faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty gender and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between faculty gender and perception of faculty academic relationship

Table 6.2: Gender versus Perception of Faculty Academic Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>faculty academic relationship</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic relationship</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation: The sig (p) value is greater than .05. Hence accept Null hypothesis. There is no difference between faculty gender and perception of faculty academic relationship.

6.3. Faculty marital status versus perception of faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty marital status and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between faculty marital status and perception of faculty academic relationship

Table 6.3: Marital Status versus Perception of Faculty Academic Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>faculty academic relationship</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic relationship</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation: The sig (p) value is greater than .05. Hence accept Null hypothesis. There is no difference between faculty marital status and perception of faculty academic relationship.

6.4. Faculty designation versus perception of faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty designation and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between faculty designation and perception of faculty academic relationship
6.5.4. Faculty leadership versus Perception of Faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty leadership and perception of faculty academic relationship  
H₁: There is difference between faculty leadership and perception of faculty academic relationship

**Interpretation:** The sig (p) value is less than .01. Hence reject Null hypothesis. There is difference between faculty leadership and perception of institutional climate

6.5.5. Faculty career growth versus Perception of Faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty career growth and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between faculty career growth and perception of faculty academic relationship

**Interpretation:** The sig (p) value is less than .05. Hence reject Null hypothesis. There is difference between faculty career growth and perception of faculty academic relationship

6.6. Regression analysis

**Table 6.6: Showing the Regression Analysis Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Stress, Work Environment, Team work, Career growth and leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5. Table with Chi-square values of dimensions with perception of faculty academic relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig Val</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>63.968</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>49.942</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>17.108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>47.723</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career growth</td>
<td>19.440</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1% level

6.5.1. Faculty work environment versus perception of faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between faculty work environment and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between faculty work environment and perception of faculty academic relationship

**Interpretation:** The sig (p) value is less than .05. Hence reject Null hypothesis. There is difference between faculty work environment and perception of faculty academic relationship

6.5.2. Faculty job stress versus Perception of Institutional climate

H₀: There is no difference between faculty job stress and perception of institutional climate
H₁: There is difference between faculty job stress and perception of institutional climate

**Interpretation:** The sig (p) value is less than .05. Hence reject Null hypothesis. There is difference between faculty job stress and perception of faculty academic relationship

6.5.3. Team work versus Perception of Faculty academic relationship

H₀: There is no difference between team work and perception of faculty academic relationship
H₁: There is difference between team work and perception of faculty academic relationship

**Interpretation:** The sig (p) value is less than .05. Hence reject Null hypothesis. There is difference between team work and perception of faculty academic relationship

6.6. Regression analysis

Dependent variable: Faculty academic relationship and independent variable: work environment, Job stress, career growth, leadership and team work
7. Conclusion

The study aims to find out the perceptual difference among faculty members toward their faculty academic relationship especially their perception toward chosen and associated key dimensions. The study revealed that all the faculty members perceive work environment, career growth, leadership and team work are the major factors that vary with respect to their perceptions towards faculty academic relationship. Moreover, regarding the demographic factors designation of the faculty plays a major role in perceiving the relationship management. Based on regression analysis, job stress has a negative impact on the perception of faculty academic relationship by the faculty members.
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