



ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at <http://www.journalijdr.com>

# IJDR

International Journal of Development Research  
Vol. 13, Issue, 11, pp. 64157-64171, November, 2023  
<https://doi.org/10.37118/ijdr.27420.11.2023>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

## ANALYTICAL STUDY OF JOB CRAFTING ON PERFORMANCE & WOK ENGAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHERS

\*<sup>1</sup>Sukriti Sharma and <sup>2</sup>Dr. Baxis Kumar I Patel

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Deepjyoti College of Commerce, Bharuch, Gujarat

<sup>2</sup>Research Supervisor, Faculty of Commerce & Business Management, M S University, Vadodara, Gujarat

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 16<sup>th</sup> August, 2023  
Received in revised form  
14<sup>th</sup> September, 2023  
Accepted 06<sup>th</sup> October, 2023  
Published online 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2023

#### Key Words:

Burnout, Education System, Engagement, Higher Education, Faculties, Job Crafting, Qualitative Education.

\*Corresponding author: Sukriti Sharma,

### ABSTRACT

The Indian education system is improving and developing as per the requirement of the society. Our country is trying to restructure its position at international level in higher education by creating and developing better qualitative education institutions. And thus, one needs to have qualified faculties with good academic experience to teach subjects and can also handle administrative roles. But this sometimes causes huge burnout situation causing engagement issues and a qualitative education suffers at the end. Employees who are engaged at work, will actively change their work environment to maintain their work engagement so that they could be able to provide best services in terms of qualitative education to students. Such change in behaviour initiated by employees is known as "job crafting".

Copyright©2023, Sukriti Sharma and Dr. Baxis Kumar I Patel. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Sukriti Sharma and Dr. Baxis Kumar I Patel. 2023. "Analytical study of job crafting on performance & wok engagement of higher education teachers". *International Journal of Development Research*, 13, (11), 64157-64171.

## INTRODUCTION

In the educational context in many countries, large-scale educational reforms have been introduced that have promoted both centralization and decentralization policies (Beusaert, Froehlich, Devos, & Riley, 2016; Dadaczynski, Paulus, & Horstman, 2020). As the global education experiences rapid pace of change, every institution and higher secondary schools seeks to boost employee's engagement which has become one of the progressive vital concerns. An issue common among educational institutes is to understand how to utilize their employees' talents, skills, and energy to create and develop better qualitative education. Institutions that fulfil their employees' essentials are most likely to win engagements of employees which contributes to the ultimate developments of students. Among the 142 countries included in the Gallup 2012 study, 13% of employees are engaged in their jobs, 63% are not engaged, and 24% are actively disengaged. In India, one of the most populous countries, engaged employees are relatively irregular. Gallup's 2012 study indicate that among Indians who are employed, 9% are engaged while 31% are actively disengaged. However, there is a considerable difference in engagement levels in India regarding education level and job type. Ninety-one percent of employed Indians are not psychologically committed to their organisations or as productive as they could be — i.e., they are not engaged at work.

Such low employee's engagement levels in India not only affect today's workplace but also influences the future innovations of tomorrow's education levels. Engagement is something given by employee which can benefit the organisation through commitment and dedication, effort, by using talent and being supportive of the organisation's goals and values. It is always seen that engaged employees feel a sense of attachment towards their organisation. Today educational institutions are facing increasing competition and rapid change in the field of education due to globalisation and rapid advances in communication and information technology. Nowadays, every institution is expecting their employees to be proactive, energetic, to achieve high quality performance standards to provide the qualitative knowledge to their students. Simply put, they need engaged employees (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012; Arevalo and Aravind, 2011; Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008). As a result, the concept of employee engagement has added significant recognition as one of the most important, critical drivers for a successful education institute. Therefore, employee commitment is required to improve performance to achieve the educational institute educational goals. Engagement is a condition that the employees are intellectually and psychologically committed to the organization.

This is because employees are an integral part of the organization, so they can be empowered to assist in achieving organizational goals (Ravikumar, 2013). Al-dalahmeh, Khalaf, and Obeidat (2018) explained that employee engagement affected the company's business performance. Similarly, Tenerife and Galingan (2017) explained that employee engagement had the implications for the company's business processes. Employee satisfaction is the key to success in employee engagement (Vorina, Simonič, & Vlasova, 2017). Teaching is such a profession in this era of 'change' since teachers are expected to exhibit new skills and dispositions that fit with the developments, which include problem-solving abilities, technology, collaboration, and communication skills. (Hargreaves A., & Fink D. ,2006), (Dede C. ,2010), (Voogt J., & Roblin N. P. ,2012) Research revealed that employees who are engaged at work, are highly energetic, self-efficacious individuals who exercise control over events that influence their lives (Schaufeli W. B., Taris T. W., Le Blanc P., Peeters M., Bakker A. B., & De Jonge J. ,2001). Employees who are engaged at work, will actively change their work environment to maintain their work engagement, if needed. (Schaufeli W., 2012). This proactive change behaviour initiated by employees is also known as "job crafting". (Wrzesniewski A., & Dutton J. E., 2001)

**Employee engagement:** In the advent of global economy, the importance of human resources development (HRD) in creating and sustaining growth and development has become more pronounced today not only in business communities, but most especially for educational institutions which are considered as the prime producers of human resource force of the country. Human resource management and development (HRMD) has risen to centre stage alongside the concerns for the efficient development and utilization of capital, technology, and natural resources. In any country around the world, managers are looking at their people today as the major source of competitive and borderless economy. As we face tougher global competitiveness, educational institutions must recognize that the human resource development must be given the priority (Javier, 1999). The effectiveness of any educational institution depends primarily on the competence and commitment of its faculty who are regarded as the heart of the educational process. Certainly, they are the most valuable and indispensable partners of the educational institution in educating the students and as such they truly have a vital role to play in the education of the youth. Employee, one of the strongest pillar and valuable asset that contributes significantly to the success and prosperity of the organization, which is truly possible when institution creates positive work environment that is based on high trust, collaborative teamwork, operational excellence and creative problem solving environment

The proverb "Educational Institutions are the nurseries of the country, and their employees are the Architects of the future" is an important interpretation of the truth that the educational institutions have reflected in the human history. Education is a crucial organization of a country; it assumes a noteworthy part in the development of any country. It empowers a nation to stand on her feet. Education field is recognized as prominent amongst the most regarded fields and has turned into the need of great significance as its aides in beautification of an individual into an educated, overall mannered, and talented individual. In this setting it comes to be crucial to study about that component, teacher, who shapes the students' future. In the field of human venture, there could be no superior work to that of a teacher. The teacher assumes a very significant part in the desirable change and enhancement. Teachers are the means through which educational plans are accomplished. Their responsibility is as deep as the whole educational objectives and societies' beliefs and desires. It turns into a spark, subsequently, to maintain a system of motivation to ensure the teachers commitment to carry out with zealous devotion their responsibility of enlightening the youth students. They are directly responsible for quality education. In recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in employee engagement. Employees are becoming more diverse. Today institutions are highly complex, more heterogeneous, and boundary-less in nature.

Institutions are diverse in nature comprising workgroups from different cultures, races, nations, regions, and religion. Everyone has its own abilities, feelings, knowledge, skills, perceptions, and attitudes. They are competing for talented people who have high performance and high competence in workplace. Expectations are ever increasing not only from the employees but employers as well. It is very challenging for the institutions to effectively manage this diverse workforce and engage them in work, create feeling of belongingness, so that they wholeheartedly contribute towards the attainment of their career as well as institution goals, and stay for longer and do not mind going extra miles for which they work. Moreover, society expects teachers to live a life that is noble and beyond criticism. Faculty members ought to be made to feel more stress free with a specific end goal to give progressively to their teaching capacity. They require empowerment and involvement in their own professional improvement, and this must be supplemented by new opportunities by educational institutes. Higher educational institutes are acknowledged as most elevated source of learning and awareness preparation institutions, and which train the specialist manpower in different fields of life. High calibre academic staffs are the foundation of successful educational system. Presently the education sector in India is in a changing phase, requiring their teachers to be more engaged in academic and research work; so that they can impart knowledge, develop skills and positive attitude of students at all levels including global markets.

A positive and healthy higher educational institute's structure comes about into increased academic staff's job Involvement and productivity. The point when academic staffs observe lack of support for their work, they are not overall roused to perform their job best in the classroom and that when teachers are not satisfied with their working conditions, they want to change institution or leave the profession at once. However, it has emerged that one important issue that the various literatures have not addressed often is the level of engagement between teachers at higher secondary schools, colleges, and universities. Though job satisfaction studies have investigated teachers in general, very few have attempted any sort of meaningful comparison between the faculties and engagement. The current study hopes to make some advances in rectifying the situation. India can achieve educational reforms only with the support of committed and motivated teachers not with their decline morale and increased turnover. The level of teacher motivation plays a decisive role in promotion of teaching and learning excellence. Retention is the first step in determining techniques to keep employees satisfied in their jobs. Job satisfaction is then the key to teachers as to any other profession'. According to Price (2004), the involvement of employee in the institution not only motivates them but also enables them to contribute effectively and efficiently. Every employee is regarded as a unique human being, not just a part in a machine, each faculty member's input should be solicited and valued by the management.

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. In this globalised education scenario "staff are not treated as part of the Institution but partners of the Institution" at the end of the day one thing that differentiate one Institute from another –Its faculties. One of the greatest underlying factors for the success or the failure of the Institution is the how the faculties are & how that is focused on the success of the Institution. The employees force the institution to address three key issues; communication, Involvement and development. In fact, the three issues can be used as a measure of an institution's maturity in the employment relationship. Employee involvement was found to be significantly related to employee motivation and employee motivation was found to be significantly related to be satisfaction. Indeed, employees with high level of involvement seem to be satisfied with their jobs, to have positive moods at work, and to be highly committed to their employers, and their careers (Carson *et al.*, 1995; Cohen, 1995). The involvement increases ownership and commitment, retains the best employees, and fosters an environment in which people choose to be motivated and contributing.

## Academic Staff

- **Conceptual definition:** individual who involved in executing a prearranged range of academic duties, basically teaching which may include the duty to shape, design and deliver courses independently (Queen's University, 1994)
- **Operational definition:** individual serving under a faculty who qualified to conduct classes and deliver the content of courses to university's students.

**Employee Retention:** Levinson (2007) also suggests that employees who are happy in their work are more likely to stay in the organisation, and Demourouti *et al.* (2001, cited in Sonnentag, 2003) found that work engagement is indeed positively related to organisational commitment. Blessing White (2008) reports that 85 per cent of engaged employees plan on sticking around compared to 27 per cent of disengaged employees. In addition, 41 per cent of engaged employees said that they would stay if the organisation is struggling to survive. The impact of personal characteristics on engagement was identified in Robinson *et al.*'s (2007) survey of employee engagement in eight organisations spanning a range of sectors. The organisations included the retail arm of a mobile telephone company, a government agency, a charity and part of a police force. The survey revealed differences in levels according to gender, age, ethnicity, disability and those with caring responsibilities:

Gender: women appeared slightly more engaged than men in some organisations.

- **Age:** engagement was highest in those under 20 years old and those 60 years plus, but dropped between 20 and 39 years old, before climbing again.
- **Ethnicity:** ethnic minority groups reported slightly higher engagement levels than their white counterparts
- **Disability:** generally, disabled individuals reported higher engagement than those without a disability or medical condition.

Similarly, Balain and Sparrow (2009) agree that engagement levels co-vary with biographical factors such as how old a person is and their gender, as well as more work-related factors such as how new they are to the organisation, their working hours, their pay and where they sit in the organisation. Defined by Harris (2000), retention is the process in which employees are encouraged to stay in organization. As a practical substance, with small turnover, each employee who is retained means one less employee to have to be recruited, selected and trained (Mathis and Jackson, 2003). Organization like HEIs also need to create an environment in which employee would be willing to stay by distinguishing their commitment (Harris, 2000). According to Maertz and Griffeth (2004), retention factors depend on the impact of "motivational forces". Moncarz *et al.* (2008, p.454) listed that are: organizational mission, goals and direction; employee recognition rewards and compensation; work environment and job design hires and promotions; training corporate culture and communication are required to positively influence employee retention and tenure. Salary is not going to be adequate to keep individuals at HEIs. If employees do not like the way they are treated in the organization or having problem with the people they work with, they will leave of absence (Logan, 2000). As recommended by Sarvadi (2007), organization had better study employees' desire through their feelings, capabilities and success towards the organization. When employees initiate that their actions for the organization fulfil the desire or criteria, they will begin to cultivate sense of belonging to the organization. Geering and Conor (2002) is also true when they suggested that employers should fulfil the personal and practical needs of employees; because people will work based on the way they are treated by the organization (Logan, 2000).

**Job Crafting:** The concept of job crafting was advocated by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) to describe ways in which employees reshape their jobs based on their own initiative. They defined job crafting as "the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work" (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 179). Wrzesniewski and Dutton, defined job crafting behavior as the process of employees redefining and reimagining their job designs in personally meaningful ways. (Wrzesniewski A., & Dutton J. E., 2001) Job crafting employees independently try to alter aspects of their job, to make a more suitable connection between the characteristics of the job and their personal needs, preferences, and abilities. (Berg J. M., Dutton J. E., & Wrzesniewski A., 2008).

**Burnout and Work Engagement in the job demands-resources model:** Furthermore, job crafting is also recognized as a core element of the JD-R theory. According to the JD-R approach to job crafting, employees could craft their job with four strategies to optimize job demands and job resources. (Bakker A. B., & Demerouti E., 2014) (Bakker A. B., 2011). First, employees may increase their structural resources at work. An example of this would be that one proactively seeks different tasks which may require innovative skills. Examples of challenge job demands are workload, time pressure, and task complexity, while hindrance job demands include role conflict, role ambiguity, and job insecurity. Second, employees may proactively increase their social job resources at work. For example, choosing with whom one will interact more frequently. Third, employees may increase their challenging demands at work. For example, employees can apply for new projects within the organization. Fourth, employees may try to decrease their job demands, for example by taking more breaks at work. Examples include autonomy, skill variety, social support, performance feedback, and opportunities for growth. Therefore, employees who are engaged and experience positive affect are more likely to show proactive behaviour because they are better able to see possibilities and think innovatively. (Bindl U. K., & Parker S. K., 2010) (Parker S. K., & Griffin M. A., 2011). Thus, engaged employees may conserve their own engagement through a process of job crafting. Job crafting is defined as the proactive changes an employee initiates to change the levels of job demands and resources in ways that align with personal needs, values, and abilities (Tims *et al.*, 2012, 2013).

Specifically, employees are assumed to reshape the characteristics of their job by means of four strategies: (1) increasing structural job resources (i.e., mobilizing autonomy, skill variety, opportunities for development at work); (2) increasing social job resources (i.e., asking for support, performance feedback, and coaching from others at work); (3) increasing challenge job demands (i.e., appending job demands with a promise of personal growth and work goal achievement); and (4) decreasing hindrance job demands (i. e., reducing job demands that thwart the accomplishment of important goals and development). Zhang and Parker (2019) recently proposed a three-level hierarchical structure of job crafting. Following this framework, the four job crafting behaviours can be categorized as either approach-oriented or avoidance-oriented based on underlying motivation. Hence, increasing structural job resources, social job resources, and challenge job demands indicates approach-oriented crafting, and decreasing hindrance job demands indicates avoidance-oriented crafting. Tims *et al.* (2012, 2013) proposed that by proactively adjusting the levels of job demands and job resources in a way that better suits their own personal characteristics, employees can reshape their jobs to be less stressful, as well as more stimulating and satisfying (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2013). As per the definition of Personal Engagement given by Kahn (1990), "it is the harnessing of organisation members selves to their work roles in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances". Rothbard (2001) is of the view that Work engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is persistent and pervasive. It is not focused on any object, event, individual or behaviour. Employee Engagement, Work Engagement are terms used interchangeably (Shaufeli2010) Schaufeli *et al.* (2002) which describes employee/

work engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor (e.g., being highly energetic), dedication (e.g., being highly involved in work), and absorption (e.g., being highly concentrated in work)”. Christian *et al.* (2011) state Work engagement as “a relatively enduring state of mind referring to the simultaneous investment of personal energies in the experience or performance of work”.

**Why we need Employee to be engaged in organisation:** The worker does not have to say or autonomy to do the work as the process is already defined by his superiors or managers. This has led to job dissatisfaction and detachment towards work leading to disengagement in extreme cases. The level of disengagement is rising in all sectors including teaching. The worker has to be engaged to give the best of his abilities to his work role. So there is a need to study engagement of workers to not only improve performance but also to maintain it.

**Need of the Study:** With the implementation of the 6th pay commission in government universities, there was a surge of enthusiasm among young professionals to pursue careers in academia. After the implementation of New Education Policy 2020, many professionals are entering the teaching area to perform research and share their valuable expertise with young students, as many universities place a focus on faculty research. The Indian higher education system provides equal opportunities for research and so young Indian faculty members are interested to fill faculty positions, providing valuable experience to young Indian students. The number of publications in prestigious journals has increased in recent years, as has the amount of joint research with foreign institutes, highlighting the value of Indian faculty. Many colleges have faculty exchange programmes also. Faculty teaching in numerous institutes has increased as demand for faculty has increased and supply has taken its time. As a result, it is necessary to keep faculty members engaged in their work.

#### Objective of the Study:

- To examine the effect of job crafting on employee engagement in the higher education.
- To examine the relationship between job features and employee engagement in the higher education.
- To study association of job crafting, work meaning, work engagement and job performance in educational organization.

**Job crafting, basic psychological needs, and well-being:** Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) illustrated that job crafting is rooted in one’s desire to take control over some aspects of one’s work, forge connections with others, and maintain a positive self-image, which all relate closely to human basic psychological needs. As such, the experience of basic psychological needs is a relevant outcome of job crafting (Bakker & Oerlemans, 2019; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014). ‘Positive aspects of the job (e.g., job resources) can foster employees’ satisfaction of basic psychological needs, which is also described in the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti *et al.*, 2001). Challenge job demands play a similar role in that they provide mastery experiences, which may, in turn, promote employee satisfaction and self-efficacy (Tims *et al.*, 2012).

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study we collected data among faculties of colleges and teachers of higher secondary school from Bharuch district using an online and offline questionnaire. A total of 132 employees completed the questionnaire out of 150 distributed representing a response rate of 88%, (high school = 11 colleges = 10). Of all the participants, 63 were male (48%) and 69 were female (52%). Job crafting was measured with the Job Crafting Scale (Tims *et al.*, 2012), which assesses six job crafting strategies by 38 items like 12 items with “characterise your opportunity with respect to your Personal Growth”, 3 items with “characterise your physical engagement with your Institution/College”, 4 items with “characterise your emotional engagement with your Institution/College”, 3 items with “characterise your cognitive engagement with your Institution/College”, 5 items with “level of engagement with your Institution/School” and 11 items with “How do you craft your job?”.

Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (often) for 11 items with “How do you craft your job?”, from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) for 15 items with “how do you characterise your physical, emotional, cognitive and levels of engagement with your Institution/College. Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (extremely low) to 5 (extremely high) for 12 items with “How would you characterise your opportunity with respect to your Personal Growth”.

**Analysis:** To examine the effect of job crafting on employee engagement in the higher education.

#### Age\* Personal Growth

	Age	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Ability to Work Independently	25to 45	1	14	34	29	16	94	47.298 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Less than 25	5	1	8	1	1	16		
	More than 45	0	0	3	11	8	22		
	Total	6	15	45	41	25	132		
Autonomy at Work	25to 45	1	11	43	27	12	94	62.609 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Less than 25	5	1	8	1	1	16		
	More than 45	0	0	4	4	14	22		
	Total	6	12	55	32	27	132		
Decision Autonomy	25to 45	1	10	40	34	9	94	38.343 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Less than 25	5	2	7	2	0	16		
	More than 45	1	2	4	8	7	22		
	Total	7	14	51	44	16	132		
Level of Participation at work	25to 45	0	0	26	54	14	94	4.950 <sup>a</sup>	.293
	Less than 25	0	0	6	9	1	16		
	More than 45	0	0	3	13	6	22		
	Total	0	0	35	76	21	132		
Potential for developing expertise and knowledge in the job	25to 45	0	3	29	30	32	94	15.520 <sup>a</sup>	.017
	Less than 25	0	1	4	8	3	16		
	More than 45	0	0	5	16	1	22		

	Total	0	4	38	54	36	132		
Working Condition at work	25to 45	0	8	27	51	8	94	4.375 <sup>a</sup>	.626
	Less than 25	0	0	5	10	1	16		
	More than 45	0	0	6	15	1	22		
	Total	0	8	38	76	10	132		
Opportunity for career progression	25to 45	0	5	46	24	19	94	32.658 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Less than 25	0	0	2	12	2	16		
	More than 45	0	1	5	3	13	22		
	Total	0	6	53	39	34	132		

**Age\* Emotional Engagement**

	Age	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I feel positive about my job	25to 45	46	44	4	0	0	94	12.192 <sup>a</sup>	.016
	Less than 25	8	8	0	0	0	16		
	More than 45	3	19	0	0	0	22		
	Total	57	71	4	0	0	132		
I feel satisfied with my job	25to 45	21	62	8	3	0	94	7.897 <sup>a</sup>	.246
	Less than 25	3	13	0	0	0	16		
	More than 45	9	13	0	0	0	22		
	Total	33	88	8	3	0	132		

**Age\* Cognitive Engagement**

	Age	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Remind myself about the significance of my work which is for the success of the Institution/School	25to 45	27	61	6	0	0	94	4.905 <sup>a</sup>	.297
	Less than 25	4	12	0	0	0	16		
	More than 45	2	18	2	0	0	22		
	Total	33	91	8	0	0	132		

**Age\* level of engagement with your Institution/School**

	Age	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I am highly engaged with my institution/school	25to 45	27	61	6	0	0	94	4.927 <sup>a</sup>	.295
	Less than 25	8	8	0	0	0	16		
	More than 45	8	14	0	0	0	22		
	Total	43	83	6	0	0	132		

**Gender \* Personal Growth**

	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Ability to Work Independently	Female	3	6	25	23	12	69	1.536 <sup>a</sup>	.820
	Male	3	9	20	18	13	63		
	Total	6	15	45	41	25	132		
Autonomy at Work	Female	3	6	30	18	12	69	1.017 <sup>a</sup>	.907
	Male	3	6	25	14	15	63		
	Total	6	12	55	32	27	132		
Decision Autonomy	Female	4	7	28	25	5	69	3.436 <sup>a</sup>	.488
	Male	3	7	23	19	11	63		
	Total	7	14	51	44	16	132		
Level of Participation at work	Female	0	0	18	41	10	69	.278 <sup>a</sup>	.870
	Male	0	0	17	35	11	63		
	Total	0	0	35	76	21	132		
Potential for developing expertise and knowledge in the job	Female	0	3	20	27	19	69	.946 <sup>a</sup>	.814
	Male	0	1	18	27	17	63		
	Total	0	4	38	54	36	132		
Working Condition at work	Female	0	5	21	39	4	69	1.103 <sup>a</sup>	.776
	Male	0	3	17	37	6	63		
	Total	0	8	38	76	10	132		
Opportunity for career progression	Female	0	2	31	18	18	69	2.275 <sup>a</sup>	.517
	Male	0	4	22	21	16	63		
	Total	0	6	53	39	34	132		

**Gender \* Emotional Engagement**

	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I feel positive about my job	Female	30	37	2	0	0	69	.012 <sup>a</sup>	.994
	Male	27	34	2	0	0	63		
	Total	57	71	4	0	0	132		
I feel satisfied with my job	Female	17	47	4	1	0	69	.501 <sup>a</sup>	.919
	Male	16	41	4	2	0	63		
	Total	33	88	8	3	0	132		

**Gender \* Cognitive Engagement**

	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Remind myself about the significance of my work which is for the success of the Institution/School	Female	17	46	6	0	0	69	1.772 <sup>a</sup>	.412
	Male	16	45	2	0	0	63		
	Total	33	91	8	0	0	132		

**Gender \* level of engagement with your Institution/School**

		1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I am highly engaged with my institution/school	Female	21	45	3	0	0	69	.342 <sup>a</sup>	.843
	Male	22	38	3	0	0	63		
	Total	43	83	6	0	0	132		

**Designation \* Personal Growth**

	Designation	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Ability to Work Independently	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	6	6	7	1	20	165.313 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	6	9	12	10	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	0	3	7	10		
	Teaching Assistant	6	2	0	0	1	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	1	29	13	4	47		
	Any other	0	0	1	6	2	9		
	Total	6	15	45	41	25	132		
Autonomy at Work	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	13	5	2	20	162.588 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	10	6	12	9	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	2	1	7	10		
	Teaching Assistant	6	2	0	0	1	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	27	13	7	47		
	Any other	0	0	7	1	1	9		
	Total	6	12	55	32	27	132		
Decision Autonomy	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	12	8	0	20	126.888 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	1	7	10	12	7	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	2	2	6	10		
	Teaching Assistant	6	1	1	1	0	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	6	21	18	2	47		
	Any other	0	0	5	3	1	9		
	Total	7	14	51	44	16	132		
Level of Participation at work	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	6	14	0	20	60.213 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	0	5	20	12	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	0	10	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	1	7	1	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	22	20	5	47		
	Any other	0	0	1	5	3	9		
	Total	0	0	35	76	21	132		
Potential for developing expertise and knowledge in the job	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	0	12	8	20	94.613 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	4	4	15	14	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	2	8	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	6	3	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	32	7	8	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	6	3	9		
	Total	0	4	38	54	36	132		
Working Condition at work	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	12	5	3	20	49.991 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	5	12	14	6	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	2	8	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	9	0	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	3	12	32	0	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	8	1	9		
	Total	0	8	38	76	10	132		
Opportunity for career progression	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	3	9	3	5	20	72.296 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	0	11	14	12	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	3	0	7	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	7	2	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	3	26	11	7	47		
	Any other	0	0	4	4	1	9		
	Total	0	6	53	39	34	132		

**Designation \* Emotional Engagement**

	Designation	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I feel positive about my job	Ad-Hoc Faculty	10	10	0	0	0	20	43.775 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	24	9	4	0	0	37		
	Associate Professor	1	9	0	0	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	4	5	0	0	0	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	10	37	0	0	0	47		
	Any other	8	1	0	0	0	9		
Total	57	71	4	0	0	132			
I feel satisfied with my job	Ad-Hoc Faculty	4	16	0	0	0	20	52.131 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	12	20	2	3	0	37		
	Associate Professor	0	10	0	0	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	3	6	0	0	0	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	13	31	3	0	0	47		
	Any other	1	5	3	0	0	9		
Total	33	88	8	3	0	132			

**Designation \* Cognitive Engagement**

	Designation	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Remind myself about the significance of my work which is for the success of the Institution/School	Ad-Hoc Faculty	10	10	0	0	0	20	22.388 <sup>a</sup>	.033
	Assistant Professor	10	24	3	0	0	37		
	Associate Professor	1	7	2	0	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	2	7	0	0	0	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	8	36	3	0	0	47		
	Any other	2	7	0	0	0	9		
Total	33	91	8	0	0	132			

**Designation \* level of engagement with your Institution/School**

	Designation	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I am highly engaged with my institution/school	Ad-Hoc Faculty	2	15	3	0	0	20	22.240 <sup>a</sup>	.035
	Assistant Professor	13	21	3	0	0	37		
	Associate Professor	1	9	0	0	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	4	5	0	0	0	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	21	26	0	0	0	47		
	Any other	2	7	0	0	0	9		
Total	43	83	6	0	0	132			

**Work Experience\* Personal Growth**

	Work Experience	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Ability to Work Independently	5-15 yrs.	1	14	15	14	7	51	30.584 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	9	12	10	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	5	1	21	15	8	50		
	Total	6	15	45	41	25	132		
Autonomy at Work	5-15 yrs.	1	8	25	13	4	51	25.629 <sup>a</sup>	.001
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	11	6	14	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	5	4	19	13	9	50		
	Total	6	12	55	32	27	132		
Decision Autonomy	5-15 yrs.	1	9	22	12	7	51	23.970 <sup>a</sup>	.002
	Above 15 yrs.	1	5	6	12	7	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	5	0	23	20	2	50		
	Total	7	14	51	44	16	132		
Level of Participation at work	5-15 yrs.	0	0	12	33	6	51	9.610 <sup>a</sup>	.048
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	6	15	10	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	0	17	28	5	50		
	Total	0	0	35	76	21	132		
Potential for developing expertise and knowledge in the job	5-15 yrs.	0	0	16	22	13	51	11.974 <sup>a</sup>	.063
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	10	16	5	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	4	12	16	18	50		
	Total	0	4	38	54	36	132		
Working Condition at work	5-15 yrs.	0	3	17	29	2	51	4.270 <sup>a</sup>	.640
	Above 15 yrs.	0	1	10	18	2	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	4	11	29	6	50		
	Total	0	8	38	76	10	132		
Opportunity for career progression	5-15 yrs.	0	1	25	17	8	51	12.091 <sup>a</sup>	.060
	Above 15 yrs.	0	2	12	4	13	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	3	16	18	13	50		
	Total	0	6	53	39	34	132		

**Work Experience\* Emotional Engagement**

	Work Experience	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I feel positive about my job	5-15 yrs.	21	26	4	0	0	51	11.532 <sup>a</sup>	.021
	Above 15 yrs.	9	22	0	0	0	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	27	23	0	0	0	50		
	Total	57	71	4	0	0	132		
I feel satisfied with my job	5-15 yrs.	7	37	4	3	0	51	11.900 <sup>a</sup>	.064
	Above 15 yrs.	10	18	3	0	0	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	16	33	1	0	0	50		
	Total	33	88	8	3	0	132		

**Work Experience\* Cognitive Engagement**

	Work Experience	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Remind myself about the significance of my work which is for the success of the Institution/School	5-15 yrs.	13	37	1	0	0	51	8.511 <sup>a</sup>	.075
	Above 15 yrs.	3	25	3	0	0	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	17	29	4	0	0	50		
	Total	33	91	8	0	0	132		

**Work Experience\*level of engagement with your Institution/School**

	Work Experience	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I am highly engaged with my institution/school	5-15 yrs.	16	32	3	0	0	51	2.080 <sup>a</sup>	.721
	Above 15 yrs.	10	21	0	0	0	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	17	30	3	0	0	50		
	Total	43	83	6	0	0	132		

**Highest level of Educational Qualification \* Personal Growth**

	Highest Level Of Educational Qualification	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Ability to Work Independently	Graduate	0	0	1	2	0	3	39.216 <sup>a</sup>	.026
	M.Phil.	0	1	1	0	0	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	1	3	14	8	26		
	Postgraduate	6	13	40	18	16	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	6	15	45	41	25	132		
Autonomy at Work	Graduate	0	0	3	0	0	3	57.676 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	M.Phil.	0	1	1	0	0	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	3	3	11	9	26		
	Postgraduate	6	8	48	19	12	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	6	12	55	32	27	132		
Decision Autonomy	Graduate	0	0	1	2	0	3	27.692 <sup>a</sup>	.273
	M.Phil.	0	1	1	0	0	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	1	3	5	11	6	26		
	Postgraduate	6	10	44	24	9	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	7	14	51	44	16	132		
Level of Participation at work	Graduate	0	0	1	0	2	3	59.394 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	0	0	23	3	26		
	Postgraduate	0	0	34	50	9	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	0	35	76	21	132		
Potential for developing expertise and knowledge in the job	Graduate	0	0	0	1	2	3	26.387 <sup>a</sup>	.091
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	2	15	9	26		
	Postgraduate	0	4	36	32	21	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	0	4	38	54	36	132		
Working Condition at work	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3	43.179 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	M.Phil.	0	0	1	1	0	2		
	MCOM	0	2	0	0	0	2		
	PhD	0	2	4	19	1	26		
	Postgraduate	0	4	33	48	8	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	0	8	38	76	10	132		
Opportunity for career	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3		



progression	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2	53.050 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	7	5	14	26		
	Postgraduate	0	6	46	30	11	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	6	53	39	34	132		

**Highest level of Educational Qualification \* Emotional Engagement**

	Highest Level Of Educational Qualification	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I feel positive about my job	Graduate	2	1	0	0	0	3	8.136 <sup>a</sup>	.774
	M.Phil.	1	1	0	0	0	2		
	MCOM	2	0	0	0	0	2		
	PhD	14	12	0	0	0	26		
	Postgraduate	37	52	4	0	0	93		
	Professional degree	1	5	0	0	0	6		
Total	57	71	4	0	0	132	46.296 <sup>a</sup>	<.001	
I feel satisfied with my job	Graduate	0	1	2	0	0			3
	M.Phil.	1	1	0	0	0			2
	MCOM	2	0	0	0	0			2
	PhD	9	17	0	0	0			26
	Postgraduate	16	69	5	3	0			93
	Professional degree	5	0	1	0	0	6		
Total	33	88	8	3	0	132			

**Highest level of Educational Qualification \* Cognitive Engagement**

	Highest Level Of Educational Qualification	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
Remind myself about the significance of my work which is for the success of the Institution/School	Graduate	0	3	0	0	0	3	40.742 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	M.Phil.	0	2	0	0	0	2		
	MCOM	0	0	2	0	0	2		
	PhD	7	15	4	0	0	26		
	Postgraduate	25	66	2	0	0	93		
	Professional degree	1	5	0	0	0	6		
Total	33	91	8	0	0	132			

**Highest level of Educational Qualification \*level of engagement with your Institution/School**

	Highest Level Of Educational Qualification	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I am highly engaged with my institution/school	Graduate	0	3	0	0	0	3	19.202 <sup>a</sup>	.084
	M.Phil.	0	2	0	0	0	2		
	MCOM	0	2	0	0	0	2		
	PhD	7	19	0	0	0	26		
	Postgraduate	30	57	6	0	0	93		
	Professional degree	6	0	0	0	0	6		
Total	43	83	6	0	0	132			

- To examine the relationship between job features and employee engagement in the higher education.

**Age \* How do you craft your job?**

	Age	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to learn new things at work	25to 45	00	6	3	53	32	94	4.789 <sup>a</sup>	.571
	Less than 25	00	1	0	9	6	16		
	More than 45	00	0	0	17	5	22		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out	25to 45	00	6	12	53	23	94	10.175 <sup>a</sup>	.117
	Less than 25	00	0	0	9	7	16		
	More than 45	00	0	0	13	9	22		
	Total	00	6	12	75	39	132		
I introduce new approaches to improve my work	25to 45	00	7	2	39	46	94	4.436 <sup>a</sup>	.618
	Less than 25	00	1	0	8	7	16		
	More than 45	00	0	1	13	8	22		
	Total	00	8	3	60	61	132		
I ask for feedback on my performance for any work given by institution/school	25to 45	00	7	13	44	30	94	7.842 <sup>a</sup>	.250
	Less than 25	00	1	1	7	7	16		
	More than 45	00	0	3	16	3	22		
	Total	00	8	17	67	40	132		
When new methods are introduced, I am one of the first to hear about them and test them	25to 45	00	3	10	52	29	94	4.556 <sup>a</sup>	.602
	Less than 25	00	0	0	9	7	16		
	More than 45	00	0	1	12	9	22		
	Total	00	3	11	73	45	132		

**Gender \*How do you craft your job?**

	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to learn new things at work	Female	00	5	1	38	25	69	2.605 <sup>a</sup>	.457
	Male	00	2	2	41	18	63		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out	Female	00	4	6	42	17	69	2.119 <sup>a</sup>	.548
	Male	00	2	6	33	22	63		
	Total	00	6	12	75	39	132		
I introduce new approaches to improve my work	Female	00	6	1	30	32	69	2.213 <sup>a</sup>	.529
	Male	00	2	2	30	29	63		
	Total	00	8	3	60	61	132		
I ask for feedback on my performance for any work given by institution/school	Female	00	6	11	34	18	69	3.620 <sup>a</sup>	.305
	Male	00	2	6	33	22	63		
	Total	00	8	17	67	40	132		
When new methods are introduced, I am one of the first to hear about them and test them	Female	00	2	6	42	19	69	2.904 <sup>a</sup>	.407
	Male	00	1	5	31	26	63		
	Total	00	3	11	73	45	132		

**Designation \*How do you craft your job?**

	Designation	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to learn new things at work	Ad-Hoc Faculty	00	3	0	10	7	20	33.642 <sup>a</sup>	.014
	Assistant Professor	00	4	3	14	16	37		
	Associate Professor	00	0	0	9	1	10		
	Teaching Assistant	00	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	00	0	0	35	11	47		
	Any other	00	0	0	7	2	9		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	3	0	17	0	20	58.354 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	3	7	11	16	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	0	10	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	4	5	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	5	29	13	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	4	5	9		
	Total	0	6	12	75	39	132		
I introduce new approaches to improve my work	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	4	0	9	7	20	43.314 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	4	1	20	12	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	0	10	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	2	7	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	2	19	26	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	0	9	9		
	Total	0	8	3	60	61	132		
I ask for feedback on my performance for any work given by institution/school	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	4	2	14	0	20	53.121 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	4	5	15	13	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	2	8	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	2	7	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	7	28	12	47		
	Any other	0	0	1	0	8	9		
	Total	0	8	17	67	40	132		
When new methods are introduced, I am one of the first to hear about them and test them	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	8	10	2	20	58.998 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	3	1	17	16	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	0	10	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	2	29	16	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	4	5	9		
	Total	0	3	11	73	45	132		

**Work Experience\* How do you craft your job?**

	Work Experience	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to learn new things at work	5-15 yrs.	0	3	3	32	13	51	17.638 <sup>a</sup>	.007
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	0	25	6	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	4	0	22	24	50		
	Total	0	7	3	79	43	132		
If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out	5-15 yrs.	0	3	7	25	16	51	7.468 <sup>a</sup>	.280
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	0	21	10	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	3	5	29	13	50		
	Total	0	6	12	75	39	132		
I introduce new approaches to improve my work	5-15 yrs.	0	3	1	25	22	51	11.285 <sup>a</sup>	.080
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	2	18	11	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	5	0	17	28	50		

	Total	0	8	3	60	61	132		
I ask for feedback on my performance for any work given by institution/school	5-15 yrs.	0	3	9	23	16	51	10.918 <sup>a</sup>	.091
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	6	19	6	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	5	2	25	18	50		
	Total	0	8	17	67	40	132		
When new methods are introduced, I am one of the first to hear about them and test them	5-15 yrs.	0	0	4	28	19	51	5.706 <sup>a</sup>	.457
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	2	18	11	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	3	5	27	15	50		
	Total	0	3	11	73	45	132		

**Highest level of Educational Qualification \* How do you craft your job?**

	Highest level of Educational Qualification	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to learn new things at work	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3	11.599 <sup>a</sup>	.867
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	0	16	10	26		
	Postgraduate	0	7	3	54	29	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	0	7	3	79	43	132		
If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3	42.333 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	MCOM	0	0	2	0	0	2		
	PhD	0	0	2	19	5	26		
	Postgraduate	0	6	8	51	28	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	6	12	75	39	132		
I introduce new approaches to improve my work	Graduate	0	0	0	0	3	3	19.944 <sup>a</sup>	.336
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	0	0	20	6	26		
	Postgraduate	0	8	3	37	45	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	8	3	60	61	132		
I ask for feedback on my performance for any work given by institution/school	Graduate	0	0	0	0	3	3	22.898 <sup>a</sup>	.195
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	3	19	4	26		
	Postgraduate	0	8	14	42	29	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	0	8	17	67	40	132		
When new methods are introduced, I am one of the first to hear about them and test them	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3	26.823 <sup>a</sup>	.082
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	0	3	21	2	26		
	Postgraduate	0	3	8	46	36	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	3	11	73	45	132		

- To study association of job crafting, work meaning, work engagement and job performance in educational organization.

**Age \* How do you craft your job?**

	Age	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to develop my capabilities	25to 45	00	6	1	48	39	94	8.852 <sup>a</sup>	.182
	Less than 25	00	0	0	7	9	16		
	More than 45	00	0	0	6	16	22		
	Total	00	6	1	61	64	132		
I try to develop myself professionally	25to 45	00	6	0	54	34	94	12.756 <sup>a</sup>	.047
	Less than 25	00	1	0	6	9	16		
	More than 45	00	0	1	17	4	22		
	Total	00	7	1	77	47	132		
I try to learn new things at work	25to 45	00	6	3	53	32	94	4.789 <sup>a</sup>	.571
	Less than 25	00	1	0	9	6	16		
	More than 45	00	0	0	17	5	22		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
I make sure that I use my capabilities to the fullest	25to 45	00	6	17	34	37	94	11.599 <sup>a</sup>	.072
	Less than 25	00	0	0	8	8	16		
	More than 45	00	0	0	12	10	22		
	Total	00	6	17	54	55	132		
I look to my supervisor for inspiration	25to 45	3	7	3	52	29	94	7.471 <sup>a</sup>	.487
	Less than 25	0	1	0	9	6	16		
	More than 45	0	0	2	16	4	22		

	Total	3	8	5	77	39	132		
I change the way I do my job to make it more enjoyable for myself	25to 45	00	7	2	45	40	94	5.383 <sup>a</sup>	.496
	Less than 25	00	1	0	8	7	16		
	More than 45	00	0	2	12	8	22		
	Total	00	8	4	65	55	132		
When a new task comes up, I sign up for it	25to 45	00	3	4	58	29	94	5.078 <sup>a</sup>	.534
	Less than 25	00	1	0	9	6	16		
	More than 45	00	1	3	13	5	22		
	Total	00	5	7	80	40	132		

**Gender \* How do you craft your job?**

	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to develop my capabilities	Female	00	4	0	32	33	69	1.607 <sup>a</sup>	.658
	Male	00	2	1	29	31	63		
	Total	00	6	1	61	64	132		
I try to develop myself professionally	Female	00	5	0	37	27	69	3.179 <sup>a</sup>	.365
	Male	00	2	1	40	20	63		
	Total	00	7	1	77	47	132		
I try to learn new things at work	Female	00	5	1	38	25	69	2.605 <sup>a</sup>	.457
	Male	00	2	2	41	18	63		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
I make sure that I use my capabilities to the fullest	Female	00	5	1	38	25	69	3.846 <sup>a</sup>	.279
	Male	00	2	2	41	18	63		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
I look to my supervisor for inspiration	Female	1	6	3	44	15	69	5.921 <sup>a</sup>	.205
	Male	2	2	2	33	24	63		
	Total	3	8	5	77	39	132		
I change the way I do my job to make it more enjoyable for myself	Female	00	6	3	31	29	69	3.036 <sup>a</sup>	.386
	Male	00	2	1	34	26	63		
	Total	00	8	4	65	55	132		
When a new task comes up, I sign up for it	Female	00	4	5	42	18	69	3.420 <sup>a</sup>	.331
	Male	00	1	2	38	22	63		
	Total	00	5	7	80	40	132		

**Designation \*How do you craft your job?**

	Designation	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to develop my capabilities	Ad-Hoc Faculty	00	3	0	4	13	20	35.996 <sup>a</sup>	.007
	Assistant Professor	00	3	0	19	15	37		
	Associate Professor	00	0	0	3	7	10		
	Teaching Assistant	00	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	00	0	1	31	15	47		
	Any other	00	0	0	1	8	9		
	Total	00	0	1	31	15	47		
I try to develop myself professionally	Ad-Hoc Faculty	00	3	0	7	10	20	29.500 <sup>a</sup>	.043
	Assistant Professor	00	4	0	17	16	37		
	Associate Professor	00	0	0	10	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	00	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	00	0	1	33	13	47		
	Any other	00	0	0	7	2	9		
	Total	00	7	1	77	47	132		
I try to learn new things at work	Ad-Hoc Faculty	00	3	0	10	7	20	33.642 <sup>a</sup>	.014
	Assistant Professor	00	4	3	14	16	37		
	Associate Professor	00	0	0	9	1	10		
	Teaching Assistant	00	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	00	0	0	35	11	47		
	Any other	00	0	0	7	2	9		
	Total	00	7	3	79	43	132		
I make sure that I use my capabilities to the fullest	Ad-Hoc Faculty	00	3	0	10	7	20	54.223 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	00	3	0	12	22	37		
	Associate Professor	00	0	0	10	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	00	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	00	0	16	15	16	47		
	Any other	00	0	1	4	4	9		
	Total	00	6	17	54	55	132		
I look to my supervisor for inspiration	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	4	0	14	2	20		
	Assistant Professor	3	4	1	14	15	37		

	Associate Professor	0	0	2	8	0	10	54.223 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	1	35	11	47		
	Any other	0	0	1	3	5	9		
	Total	3	8	5	77	39	132		
I change the way I do my job to make it more enjoyable for myself	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	4	0	9	7	20	59.091 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	4	0	13	20	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	2	8	0	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	2	7	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	2	30	15	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	3	6	9		
Total	0	8	4	65	55	132			
When a new task comes up, I sign up for it	Ad-Hoc Faculty	0	0	3	14	3	20	69.958 <sup>a</sup>	<.001
	Assistant Professor	0	5	0	18	14	37		
	Associate Professor	0	0	4	5	1	10		
	Teaching Assistant	0	0	0	3	6	9		
	Teacher at Higher Secondary School	0	0	0	37	9	47		
	Any other	0	0	0	2	7	9		
	Total	0	5	7	80	40	132		

**Work Experience\* How do you craft your job?**

	Work Experience	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to develop my capabilities	5-15 yrs.	0	3	1	26	21	51	5.672 <sup>a</sup>	.461
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	0	12	19	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	3	0	23	24	50		
	Total	0	6	1	61	64	132		
I try to develop myself professionally	5-15 yrs.	0	3	0	31	17	51	16.891 <sup>a</sup>	.010
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	1	25	5	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	4	0	21	25	50		
	Total	0	7	1	77	47	132		
I try to learn new things at work	5-15 yrs.	0	3	3	32	13	51	17.638 <sup>a</sup>	.007
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	0	25	6	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	4	0	22	24	50		
	Total	0	7	3	79	43	132		
I make sure that I use my capabilities to the fullest	5-15 yrs.	0	3	7	23	18	51	8.487 <sup>a</sup>	.205
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	1	16	14	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	3	9	15	23	50		
	Total	0	6	17	54	55	132		
I look to my supervisor for inspiration	5-15 yrs.	3	3	1	23	21	51	20.409 <sup>a</sup>	.009
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	3	24	4	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	5	1	30	14	50		
	Total	3	8	5	77	39	132		
I change the way I do my job to make it more enjoyable for myself	5-15 yrs.	0	3	1	24	23	51	12.189 <sup>a</sup>	.058
	Above 15 yrs.	0	0	3	19	9	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	5	0	22	23	50		
	Total	0	8	4	65	55	132		
When a new task comes up, I sign up for it	5-15 yrs.	0	0	3	28	20	51	13.458 <sup>a</sup>	.036
	Above 15 yrs.	0	1	4	20	6	31		
	Less than 5 yrs.	0	4	0	32	14	50		
	Total	0	5	7	80	40	132		

**Highest level of Educational Qualification \* How do you craft your job?**

	Highest level of Educational Qualification	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	
								Value	Significance (2-sided)
I try to develop my capabilities	Graduate	0	0	0	1	2	3	13.985 <sup>a</sup>	.730
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	0	0	10	16	26		
	Postgraduate	0	6	1	47	39	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	6	1	61	64	132		
I try to develop myself professionally	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3	13.726 <sup>a</sup>	.747
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	0	16	10	26		
	Postgraduate	0	7	1	53	32	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
Total	0	7	1	77	47	132			
I try to learn new things at work	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3		
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		

	PhD	0	0	0	16	10	26	11.599 <sup>a</sup>	.867
	Postgraduate	0	7	3	54	29	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	0	7	3	79	43	132		
I make sure that I use my capabilities to the fullest	Graduate	0	0	1	0	2	3	25.660 <sup>a</sup>	.108
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	0	13	13	26		
	Postgraduate	0	6	16	39	32	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	6	17	54	55	132		
I look to my supervisor for inspiration	Graduate	0	0	1	2	0	3	37.159 <sup>a</sup>	.042
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	3	0	3	17	3	26		
	Postgraduate	0	8	1	50	34	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	3	8	5	77	39	132		
I change the way I do my job to make it more enjoyable for myself	Graduate	0	0	0	3	0	3	19.944 <sup>a</sup>	.336
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	0	2	2		
	PhD	0	0	2	15	9	26		
	Postgraduate	0	8	2	46	37	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	0	6	6		
	Total	0	8	4	65	55	132		
When a new task comes up, I sign up for it	Graduate	0	0	0	2	1	3	22.898 <sup>a</sup>	.195
	M.Phil.	0	0	0	1	1	2		
	MCOM	0	0	0	2	0	2		
	PhD	0	1	4	17	4	26		
	Postgraduate	0	4	3	53	33	93		
	Professional degree	0	0	0	5	1	6		
	Total	0	5	7	80	40	132		

## CONCLUSION

Employee engagement is an important factor for improving teaching learning and also keeping the faculty more satisfied and committed to their work. Organisations have to take steps to improve engagement by making their job less stressful, leaving them to concentrate on their core job – teaching, involving faculty in decision making, and having a positive work environment culture to keep their faculty engaged. Since teachers and higher institutions have to cope with a continuously changing environment, it is important to recruit and retain teachers who experience their work to be meaningful. To do so, the experience of meaningful work may be the starting point for designing jobs and shaping HR policies and practices within. The cultivation of meaningful work is not only an important task for HR but also for management. For example, senior management can play a crucial role in the cultivation of meaningful work within institutions by clearly communication the goals, values, and contributions to society. In addition, they can show employees how the objectives of their work connect to their intrinsic values and beliefs. Further, trainers should provide teachers with opportunities to craft their job. This present study showed that job crafting was positively related to teacher's engagement level. Their results showed that employees might craft their jobs to create healthy and motivating working conditions. Through job crafting, employees may enhance their personal resources and their sustainable workability. Thus, it is recommended that managers emphasize the importance of job crafting to the employees, as it may eventually affect their employability. Managers can do so by sharing examples of their own job crafting behaviour with their employees and by sharing positive job crafting experiences of team members. In addition, institutions can also stimulate and enhance job crafting behaviour among employees by offering job crafting interventions.

## REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research, and practice. MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., & Ray, S. (2003). A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity identification and development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1), 105-123
- Albrook, R. (1967). Participative Management-Time for a Second Look. New York: Reinhardt and Winston Inc.
- Alexander, D., Chant, D., & Cox, B. (1994). What motivates people to become teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 19, 5, 40–49.
- Al-dalalmeh, M., Khalaf, R., & Obeidat, B. (2018). The effect of employee engagement on organizational performance via the mediating role of job satisfaction: The case of IT employees in Jordanian banking sector. *Modern Applied Science*, 12(6), 17-43
- AndrewaOlogbo C, SaudahSofianBP. Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 2012; 40:498–508. 4. Cristina WDEMZ, David PP
- Annam Akram., Muhammad Ali Jinnah., & Muhammad Hassaan. (2013) Impact of job autonomy on work engagement: the mediating role of job crafting in Universities of Pakistan *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, ISSN (2226-8235) Vol-3, Issue 1, 31-44.
- Arakawa, D., & Greenberg, M. (2007). Optimistic managers and the influence on productivity and employee engagement in a technology organization: Implications for coaching psychologists. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2(1), 78-89.
- Attridge, M. (2009). Measuring and managing employee work engagement: A review of research and business literature. *Journal of Workplace Behavioural Health*, 24
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- Bakker, A. B. & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 189-206

11. Bakker, A.B. (2010). Engagement and “job crafting”: Engaged employees create their own great place to work. In S.L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research, and practice* (pp. 229-244). Glos, UK: Edward Elgar
12. Bakker A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 265–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214411414534>
13. Bakker A.B., Tims M and Derks D (2012) Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations* 65(10): 1359–1378.
14. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A.I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 1, 389–411
15. Bakker A. B., & Demerouti E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. In: Chen P.Y. & Cooper C.L. (Ed.), *Wellbeing: A complete reference guide, work and wellbeing* (pp.1–28). New York: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019>
16. Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. G. M. (2019). Daily job crafting and momentary work engagement: A self-determination and self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 112, 417–430.
17. Baumruk, R., (2004) „The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business successes, *Workspan*, Vol. 47, pp. 48-52
18. Berg J. M., Dutton J. E., & Wrzesniewski A. (2008). What is job crafting and why does it matter? Theory to-practice briefing. Ann Arbor, MI: School of Business, University of Michigan Ross. Retrieved from <http://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/What-is-Job-Crafting-and-Why-Does-it-Matter1.pdf>
19. Berg, J. M., Grant, A. M., & Johnson, V. (2010). When callings are calling: Crafting work and leisure in pursuit of unanswered occupational callings. *Organization Science*, 21, 973-994.
20. Bindl U. K., & Parker S. K. (2010). 32 Feeling good and performing well? Psychological engagement and positive behaviours at work. *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research, and practice*, 385.
21. Chanman-Tak, Yue-Chor, Ching & Yin-Cheong (1997). Teachers’ Participation in Decision– Making: The case of SMI Schools in Hong Kong: *Educational Journal*, 25, (2). <http://sunzi.libhku.hk/view/33/3300636.pdf> (Accessed. Dec.19, 2011)
22. Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., Slaughter, J.E. (2011), Work engagement: a quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 89–136
23. Crockenberg, V. and Clark W. (1979). Teachers Participation in School Decision Making. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project the Phi Delta Kappan,
24. Dede C. (2010). Comparing frameworks for 21st century skills. In: Bellanca J., & Brandt R. (Ed.), *21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn*, 20, 51–76. Solution Tree Press.
25. Du Toit, Erasmus, Strydom (2008) *Introduction to Business Management 7th edition* Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa
26. Fairlie, P. (2011). Meaningful work, employee engagement, and other key employee outcomes: Implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 508-525. doi: 10.1177/1523422311431679
27. Field A (2003). “Getting a Handle on Employee Motivation”. *Harvard Management Communication Letter*, September 2003. Available: <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/pubitem.jhtml>
28. Gardian, A. and Rathore, H. C. (2010). Teacher Participation in Decision –Making Process: Reality and Repercussions in India Higher Education, *Kamacha, Varanasi, India*, Vol. 40 No 5, pp 657-671
29. Hargreaves A., & Fink D. (2006). *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bas
30. Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., and Hayes, T.L.(2002). ‘Bu-si-ness-Unit-Level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A me-ta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 7(2), pp.268–279
31. Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman BB (1959) *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons
32. John, L. Cotton. (1993, February 16). *Employee Involvement: Methods for Improving Performance and Work Attitudes*. Sage publication.
33. Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4), pp. 692–724.
34. Kothari, C. K. (1990). *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: WishwaPrakash an
35. Parker S. K., & Griffin M. A. (2011). Understanding active psychological states: Embedding engagement in a wider nomological net and closer attention to performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 60–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.532869>
36. Schaufeli W. B., Taris T. W., Le Blanc P., Peters M., Bakker A. B., & De Jonge J. (2001). Maaktarbeidgezond. Op zoek naar de bevlogenwerknemer. *De Psychology*, 422–428. Retrieved from: <https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/165n.pdf>
37. Schaufeli W. (2012). Work engagement: What do we know and where do we go? *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 3–10.
38. Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2014). Optimising employee mental health: The relationship between intrinsic need satisfaction, job crafting, and employee wellbeing. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, 15, 957–977.
39. Tenerife, J. T., & Galingan, R. L. (2017). Employee engagement analytics: The relationship among organization engagement, job engagement, and job satisfaction explored through path analysis. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Asia-Pacific Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Social Sciences (AP17Taiwan Conference)*.
40. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 80, 173–186.
41. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18, 230–240.
42. Voogt J., & Roblin N. P. (2012). A comparative analysis of international frameworks for 21st century competences: Implications for national curriculum policies. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 44(3), 299–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2012>
43. Vorina, A., Simonič, M., & Vlasova, M. (2017). An analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement. *Economic Themes*, 55(2), 243-262
44. Wrzesniewski A., & Dutton J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of management review*, 26(2), 179–201. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011>
45. Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 40, 126–146.