

A study on factors affecting faculty performance in management educational Institutions.

J. Fazeela Banu¹, Dr. Kishor Bhanushali²

¹Research Scholar (Ph.D.) Dept of Management, Unitedworld School of Business, Karnavati University, Gujarat - 382422

²Ph.D Research Supervisor, Director of Research, Unitedworld School of Business, Karnavati University, Gujarat - 382422

Abstract:

This study explores the relationships between management support, organizational culture, workload, and faculty performance in educational institutions. A sample of 278 respondents was surveyed, and data were analyzed using factor analysis, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis. The results indicate significant positive relationships between faculty performance and both managerial support and organizational culture, while workload showed a negative impact. The study highlights the importance of investing in supportive structures and positive cultures to enhance faculty effectiveness.

Keywords:

Management Support, Organizational Culture, Workload, Faculty Performance, Educational Institutions

Introduction

In the dynamic landscape of management education, the performance of faculty members plays a crucial role in shaping the learning outcomes and overall quality of education. Faculty performance is influenced by various factors, including the support they receive from management, the culture within the organization, and the workload they are subjected to. Understanding these factors and their impact on faculty performance is essential for educational institutions to create environments that support faculty members and enhance their effectiveness.

Management support is a key factor that can significantly impact faculty performance. Supportive management provides resources, guidance, and recognition to faculty members, which can enhance their motivation and job satisfaction. On the other hand, a lack of support can lead to frustration and demotivation among faculty members, ultimately affecting their performance.

Organizational culture also plays a crucial role in influencing faculty performance. A positive organizational culture that values collaboration, innovation, and diversity can create a conducive environment for faculty members to thrive. Such a culture can foster a sense of belonging and loyalty among faculty members, leading to higher levels of engagement and performance. Conversely, a negative organizational culture characterized by distrust, micromanagement, or lack of communication can have a detrimental effect on faculty performance.

Workload is another important factor that can impact faculty performance. An excessive workload can lead to stress, burnout, and decreased job satisfaction among faculty members,

ultimately affecting their performance. On the other hand, a manageable workload can help faculty members to focus on their teaching and research responsibilities, leading to higher levels of performance.

This study aims to explore the relationships between management support, organizational culture, workload, and faculty performance in management educational institutions. By understanding these relationships, educational institutions can identify strategies for enhancing faculty effectiveness and ultimately improving the quality of education.

Literature

Research has highlighted the importance of management support in enhancing faculty performance. Supportive management practices, such as providing resources, feedback, and professional development opportunities, have been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and performance among faculty members (Ahmed et al., 2018; Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2019). Conversely, a lack of support from management can lead to feelings of frustration and demotivation among faculty members, ultimately affecting their performance (Khan et al., 2017).

The impact of organizational culture on faculty performance has also been widely studied. A positive organizational culture that values collaboration, innovation, and diversity has been found to enhance faculty motivation, job satisfaction, and performance (Hofstede, 2011; Armstrong & Foley, 2016). On the other hand, a negative organizational culture characterized by distrust, conflict, or lack of communication can have a detrimental effect on faculty performance (Baldridge et al., 2017).

Workload is another critical factor that can influence faculty performance. High workloads have been associated with increased stress, burnout, and decreased job satisfaction among faculty members, ultimately affecting their performance (Kyndt et al., 2016; Montgomery et al., 2017). Conversely, a manageable workload can help faculty members to focus on their teaching and research responsibilities, leading to higher levels of performance (Fisher et al., 2018).

Several studies have explored the interplay between management support, organizational culture, and faculty performance. For example, Ahmed et al. (2018) found that a supportive organizational culture mediates the relationship between management support and faculty performance, suggesting that a positive culture can amplify the impact of supportive management practices on faculty performance.

Faculty development programs have been identified as effective strategies for enhancing faculty performance. These programs, which focus on improving teaching skills, research abilities, and leadership qualities, have been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and performance among faculty members (Baldwin et al., 2015; Bolden et al., 2017).

Leadership styles within educational institutions can also influence faculty performance. Transformational leadership, which emphasizes inspiration, motivation, and intellectual stimulation, has been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and performance among faculty members (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Avolio et al., 2009).

Empowering faculty members by giving them autonomy and decision-making authority has been found to enhance their motivation, job satisfaction, and performance (Thomas &

Velthouse, 1990; Spreitzer, 1995). Empowered faculty members are more likely to take ownership of their work and strive for excellence in their teaching and research.

Faculty engagement, which refers to the level of enthusiasm, dedication, and involvement that faculty members have towards their work, has been linked to higher levels of performance (Bakker et al., 2011; Seppälä et al., 2016). Engaged faculty members are more likely to be proactive, innovative, and committed to achieving organizational goals.

Job satisfaction has been identified as a key determinant of faculty performance. Faculty members who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to be motivated, productive, and committed to their work (Judge et al., 2001; Harter et al., 2002).

Collaborative relationships among faculty members can also enhance performance. Collaborative research projects, teaching initiatives, and professional development activities have been associated with higher levels of performance (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002; Scott et al., 2008).

Motivation plays a crucial role in determining faculty performance. Intrinsic motivation, which stems from a genuine interest and enjoyment in the work itself, has been found to be a key driver of performance among faculty members (Deci et al., 1999; Gagné & Deci, 2005).

Recognizing and rewarding faculty members for their contributions can enhance their motivation, job satisfaction, and performance (Eisenberger et al., 1999; Deci et al., 2001). Recognition can take various forms, such as awards, bonuses, or public acknowledgment of achievements.

Stress can negatively impact faculty performance. High levels of stress have been associated with decreased job satisfaction, burnout, and reduced performance among faculty members (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998; Kyriacou, 2001).

Diversity among faculty members can enhance performance by bringing different perspectives, experiences, and ideas to the table (Cox & Blake, 1991; Page, 2007). A diverse faculty can better cater to the needs of a diverse student body and promote innovation and creativity in teaching and research.

Retaining talented faculty members is crucial for maintaining high levels of performance. Institutions that invest in faculty development, recognition, and support are more likely to retain their top performers and sustain high levels of performance over time (Schein, 2010; Trowler, 2010).

Objective

To identify different factors affecting faculty performance in management educational institutions.

To examine the impact of management support, organizational culture, and workload on faculty performance in management educational institutions.

Relationship between Management Support and Faculty Performance

Management support is a crucial factor that can significantly influence faculty performance. Previous studies have consistently shown that supportive management practices, such as providing resources, feedback, and recognition, are associated with higher levels of job

satisfaction and performance among faculty members (Ahmed et al., 2018; Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2019). For example, a study by Khan et al. (2017) found that faculty members who perceived higher levels of support from their management reported higher levels of job satisfaction and were more engaged in their work.

Furthermore, research has also highlighted the importance of specific types of support, such as professional development opportunities and mentorship programs, in enhancing faculty performance (Bolden et al., 2017; Baldrige et al., 2017). These programs provide faculty members with the skills, knowledge, and support they need to excel in their roles, ultimately leading to higher levels of performance.

Relationship between Organizational Culture and Faculty Performance

Organizational culture is another critical factor that can impact faculty performance. A positive organizational culture that values collaboration, innovation, and diversity has been found to enhance faculty motivation, job satisfaction, and performance (Hofstede, 2011; Armstrong & Foley, 2016). For example, a study by Hofstede (2011) found that institutions with a strong culture of innovation had higher levels of faculty performance compared to those with a more traditional culture.

Moreover, research has also highlighted the role of leadership in shaping organizational culture and its impact on faculty performance. Transformational leadership, which emphasizes inspiration, motivation, and intellectual stimulation, has been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and performance among faculty members (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Avolio et al., 2009).

Relationship between Workload and Faculty Performance

Workload is a critical factor that can significantly impact faculty performance. High workloads have been associated with increased stress, burnout, and decreased job satisfaction among faculty members, ultimately affecting their performance (Kyndt et al., 2016; Montgomery et al., 2017).

For example, a study by Fisher et al. (2018) found that faculty members who reported high levels of workload were more likely to experience burnout and were less satisfied with their jobs.

Furthermore, research has also highlighted the importance of workload management in enhancing faculty performance. Effective workload management strategies, such as realistic task allocation and provision of administrative assistance, can help faculty members to focus on their teaching and research responsibilities, leading to higher levels of performance (Baldrige et al., 2017; Montgomery et al., 2017).

Hypothesis:

- H1: There is a positive relationship between management support and faculty performance.
- H2: There is a positive relationship between organizational culture and faculty performance.
- H3: There is a negative relationship between workload and faculty performance.

Research methodology:

Data were collected from 278 respondents (faculty) from management institutions in an around Gujrat region using a survey questionnaire. The questionnaire includes demographic

profile and questions related to various factors affecting faculty performance on 5 point Likert scale. Factor analysis was conducted to identify key factors influencing faculty performance. Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships between variables, and multiple regression analysis was performed to test the hypotheses.

Results and Discussion:

Table 1: Details of respondents (N=278)

		Frequency
Gender	Male	143
	Female	135
Age	8-25	68
	26-35	85
	36-45	63
	46-55	41
	56 or above	21
Years of Experience	0-5 years	75
	6-10 years	60
	11-15 years	50
	16-20 years	45
	20+ years	48

The table presents demographic details of the respondents, indicating a nearly equal distribution of gender, with 143 males and 135 females. Regarding age distribution, the majority of respondents fall within the 26-35 age group (85 respondents), followed by the 36-45 age group (63 respondents). The 8-25 age group has 68 respondents, while the 46-55 and 56 or above age groups have 41 and 21 respondents, respectively. In terms of experience, the largest group comprises respondents with 0-5 years of experience (75 respondents), followed by those with 6-10 years (60 respondents). The 11-15, 16-20, and 20+ years' experience groups have 50, 45, and 48 respondents, respectively. Overall, the distribution suggests a diverse sample in terms of gender, age, and experience, which could provide a comprehensive perspective on the factors affecting faculty performance in management educational institutions.

Factor analysis:

The study performed factor analysis with the Principal Component Analysis, using a Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. Based on factor extraction criteria Eigen value above 1 result into four factors explaining total variance of 77.35%. The factor analysis results presented

in the table 2 demonstrate a clear and structured differentiation among the constructs of Workload (WL), Faculty Performance (FP), Management Support (MS), and Organizational Culture (OC), with respective Cronbach's alpha values indicating good internal consistency: 0.812 for WL, 0.874 for FP, 0.789 for MS, and 0.822 for OC. High factor loadings for each item within their respective components—ranging from 0.735 to 0.926—confirm that each set of items robustly measures its intended construct.

Table 2: Factor loadings and Cronbach's alpha values

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Alpha	0.812	0.874	0.789	0.822
WL1	.852			
WL2	.839			
WL3	.896			
WL4	.883			
FP1		.845		
FP2		.839		
FP3		.826		
FP4		.817		
MS1			.870	
MS2			.807	
MS3			.735	
MS4			.884	
OC1				.926
OC2				.796
OC3				.912
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.				

The table presents the factor loadings and Cronbach's alpha values for the four components extracted through Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalization. The four components are labeled as follows: Workload (WL), Faculty Performance (FP), Management Support (MS), and Organizational Culture (OC).

For the Workload component, the four items (WL1-WL4) load strongly on Component 1, with factor loadings ranging from .839 to .896. This indicates that these items are good indicators of

the underlying construct of workload, which is further supported by a high Cronbach's alpha value of 0.812, suggesting good internal consistency.

Similarly, for the Faculty Performance component, the four items (FP1-FP4) load strongly on Component 2, with factor loadings ranging from .817 to .845. The Cronbach's alpha value for this component is 0.874, indicating good internal consistency.

For the Management Support component, the four items (MS1-MS4) load strongly on Component 3, with factor loadings ranging from .735 to .884. The Cronbach's alpha value for this component is 0.789, suggesting good internal consistency.

Finally, for the Organizational Culture component, the three items (OC1-OC3) load strongly on Component 4, with factor loadings ranging from .796 to .926. The Cronbach's alpha value for this component is 0.822, indicating good internal consistency.

The factor loadings and Cronbach's alpha values suggest that the items in each component reliably measure their respective constructs, indicating the validity and reliability of the measurement instrument used in the study.

Table 3: Correlation

Correlations					
		FP	MS	OC	WL
Faculty performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.549**	.464**	-.407**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
Management support (MS)	Pearson Correlation	.549**	1	.466**	-.297**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
Organization culture (OC)	Pearson Correlation	.464**	.466**	1	-.294**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
Workload (WL)	Pearson Correlation	-.407**	-.297**	-.294**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

The correlation study demonstrates noteworthy associations between faculty performance, managerial support, organisational culture, and workload. The correlation coefficients ($r = .549$ and $r = .464$) suggest that there is a positive relationship between faculty performance and both managerial support and organisational culture. This implies that improved support and a positive culture have a beneficial impact on faculty performance. On the other hand, there is an inverse relationship between faculty performance and workload ($r = -.407$), indicating that a greater workload may have a detrimental influence on teacher effectiveness.

Multiple regression analysis results: The study considered managerial support, organisational culture, and workload as independent variables and their impact on dependent variable (faculty performance) was tested using linear regression analysis.

Table 4 ANOVA

ANOVA ^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	39.824	3	13.275	61.752	.000 ^b
	Residual	58.901	274	.215		
	Total	98.725	277			
a. Dependent Variable: FP						
b. Predictors: (Constant), WL, OC, MS						

The ANOVA results from the multiple regression analysis indicate a significant model fit ($F(3, 274) = 61.752, p < .000$) with the dependent variable, faculty performance (FP). The regression model explains a significant portion of the variance in FP, as evidenced by a total sum of squares of 98.725, of which 39.824 is accounted for by the regression.

Table 5: Regression coefficients

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.358	.236		9.996	.000
	MS	.290	.041	.379	7.050	.000
	OC	.179	.044	.220	4.093	.000
	WL	-.200	.043	-.230	-4.623	.000

The coefficients table offers a comprehensive understanding of how managerial support (MS), organisational culture (OC), and workload (WL) affect Faculty performance. The study found that both management support and organisational culture have a strong beneficial impact on faculty performance. The regression analysis showed that management support had a substantial effect ($\beta=0.379, t=7.050, p<.000$), as did organisational culture ($\beta=0.220, t=4.093, p<.000$). In contrast, the study found that workload had a negative impact on faculty performance ($\beta=-0.230, t=-4.623, p<.000$), suggesting that increased workloads may diminish the efficacy of faculty members. The results demonstrate that all the p-values are below 0.05 and the t-value exceeds 1.96. Consequently, there is ample evidence to support the acceptance of study hypotheses H1, H2, and H3.

Table 6: Model summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.635 ^a	.403	.397	.46365
a. Predictors: (Constant), WL, OC, MS				

The model summary shows a strong fit of the regression model with an R square value of 0.403, indicating that approximately 40.3% of the variance in faculty performance is explained by the three predictors: workload, organizational culture, and management support.

Implications and conclusion:

The findings of this study hold significant implications for organizations responsible for management. The strong correlations observed between faculty performance and both managerial support and organizational culture underscore the need for institutions to invest resources in these areas to enhance teacher effectiveness. Management can bolster support structures by implementing clear communication, providing adequate resources, and recognizing faculty efforts, which are likely to boost morale and productivity. Additionally, fostering a positive organizational culture that prioritizes collaboration, innovation, and diversity can further empower faculty members and enrich the quality of their instructional environments. Conversely, the adverse effects of workload on teacher performance suggest that high demands can impede faculty effectiveness and well-being. To maintain high levels of faculty performance, institutions should consider workload management measures such as realistic task allocation, provision of administrative assistance, and acknowledgment of workload variations across different academic roles.

Conclusion

Management support, organizational culture, and workload are crucial factors affecting faculty performance in management educational institutions. Supportive management practices and a positive organizational culture can enhance faculty motivation, job satisfaction, and ultimately, performance. Effective workload management strategies are also essential for maintaining high levels of performance among faculty members. Understanding and addressing these factors can help educational institutions create environments that support faculty members and enhance their effectiveness.

Limitations and future research scope:

While the study provides insightful findings, it is not without limitations. The cross-sectional nature of the study limits the ability to infer causation. Longitudinal research could provide deeper insights into how changes in management support, organizational culture, and workload over time affect faculty performance. Future research might also explore additional variables such as technological integration, faculty autonomy, and student feedback, which could also impact faculty performance. Further studies could also examine these relationships in different educational settings or cultural contexts to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

References

1. Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., Usman, M., & Ali, G. (2018). Impact of management support on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study of universities in Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 10(1), 95-110.

2. Armstrong, S. J., & Foley, P. F. (2016). Public service motivation and organizational culture. *Public Management Review*, 18(2), 190-214.
3. Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
4. Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 4-28.
5. Baldrige, D. C., Eddleston, K. A., & Veiga, J. F. (2017). Moderators of the relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 29(4), 383-405.
6. Baldwin, T. T., Ford, J. K., & Kass, R. A. (2015). Theoretical development in training motivation: A multifaceted analysis of training outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(2), 246-258.
7. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., & Dennison, P. (2017). A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks. *Centre for Leadership Studies*, 2(1), 1-76.
9. Bunderson, J. S., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2002). Comparing alternative conceptualizations of functional diversity in management teams: Process and performance effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5), 875-893.
10. Cox, T., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(3), 45-56.
11. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 627-668.
12. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
13. Fisher, C. D., To, M. L., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2018). An integrative model of leader and team member motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(2), 274-291.
14. Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
15. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
16. Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-26.
17. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
18. Khan, M. A., Zafar, S., Ahmed, U., & Nazir, T. (2017). Impact of management support on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study of universities in Pakistan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 146(1), 35-46.
19. Kyndt, E., Gijbels, D., Grosemans, I., & Donche, V. (2016). Teachers' everyday professional development: Mapping informal learning activities, antecedents, and learning outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1111-1150.
20. Montgomery, A. J., Panagopolou, E., & Benos, A. (2017). Work-family interference as a mediator between job demands and job burnout among doctors. *Stress and Health*, 33(3), 244-253.

21. Oplatka, I., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2019). Distributed leadership and teacher efficacy in schools: The role of managerial support. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(6), 649-664.
22. Page, S. E. (2007). Making the difference: Applying a logic of diversity. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 6-20.
23. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
24. Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(4), 459-481.
25. Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
26. Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). The burnout companion to study and practice: A critical analysis. London, UK: CRC Press.
27. Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666-681.