A study on identifying effect of demographic variables on employee engagement among faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR

Dr. Komal Bhardwaj

Associate Professor

JB Knowledge Park

Abstract

Employees are the most important resources for any organization. With the development of new technology and techniques, organization are growing day by day. People can move freely from one organisation to another organisation, not only within the country but in the whole world too. Workforce Diversity and employee engagement are the two facets of same coin. As when we deal with the engagement of employees, we also have to face the challenges of diverse workforce. This research fills the research gap in finding the impact of demographic factors on employee engagement in Higher educational Institutions among teaching faculty members of Delhi/NCR.

The main objective of this study is to find the impact of various demographic variables such gender, age, religion and educational qualification of faculty members on their Cognitive engagement, Physical engagement, Behavioral engagement and Emotional engagement.

The reliable and valid structured questionnaire having 46 items related to workforce diversity and employee engagement is used to collect data from 447 teaching faculty members through online platforms like E-mails, Linked In, Face book and WhatsApp.

The data is collected from UGC approved Higher Educational Institutions in Faridabad, Noida, Palwal and Ghaziabad. The methodology used by the author is quantitative. F- test, T- Test and One-way Anova has been used in the study. The results shows that teaching faculty members in HEI's in Delhi/NCR are more cognitively engaged than physical, emotional & behavioral engagement.

Keywords: Diversity, Cultural Diversity, Workforce Diversity, Employee Engagement, Employee Performance, Engaging Faculty, Higher education, Indian Faculty members.

Introduction

People from different backgrounds, cultures, and beliefs need to interact more than ever before due to the world's growing globalization (Harvey & Allard, 2015).
Due to the creation of businesses with a diverse workforce brought about by corporate globalization and the unprecedented cross-border movement of workers, workplace diversity is now a crucial management concern (Yang & Konrad, 2011). In recent years, the significance of managing educational diversity has come to light due to the escalation of global competitiveness and the relative prosperity of nations that prioritize labor investment (Holden, Linnerud, Banister, Schwanitz, & Wierling, 2017).

Numerous factors, such as faculty expertise and pedagogical approach, but also faculty employee engagement, are necessary for a high-quality student experience (Marken, 2021). The foundation of a successful organization is made up of dedicated and active individuals. Engaged human resources have always been the foundation of any institution's or organization's success stories. They stimulate market and company success (Nagoji et al., 2022).
Faculty members must be involved in academia. Pedagogical style and faculty expertise are two factors that affect a high-quality student experience, but so is faculty employee engagement (Marken, 2021). Committed and involved individuals are the foundation of a successful organization. The contributions of involved human resources have always been the foundation of any institution's or organization's success. They serve as a driving force behind commercial and market success (Nagoji et al., 2022).
Academic staff members must be involved. Because of their special characteristics, universities are supposed to house the most highly qualified and specialized thinkers.

According to Gallup, workers are more likely to recommend their company as a place to work, take fewer sick days, represent lower healthcare costs for their employer, and are less likely to leave. Faculty engagement is a powerful predictor of a high-quality student experience, and while these are important findings for schools, the student experience is equally important (Marken,2021).

Students can participate in critical discourse, develop tolerance and cultural understanding, and overcome differences through higher education.

Highly engaged faculty members are a great asset to any organization, while disengaged faculty members could prove to be a significant liability. Teachers' disengaged state is reflected in

almost all faculty member studies, which reveal an increasing propensity for absenteeism, plans to quit, and early retirement (Raina et al., 2015). Even though researchers and consultants from all over the world have studied employee engagement, there is a clear need for a context-specific engagement metric tailored to the work done by HEI faculty, and research on how well institutionally oriented engagement models fit in educational settings may be undertaken. colleges.

Literature Review

According to Litten, Vaughan, and Wildermuth (2011), employee engagement is "a multifarious and vibrant process that illustrates each person's distinctive, personal association with work." The ground-breaking research on the idea of engagement is attributed to Kahn (1990, 1992). According to his research, employees typically fall somewhere on a spectrum regarding how well they believe they can express who they want to be in their job. People are more likely to be involved if they can find more supportive environments for their authentic expression, while those who witness less supportive environments are more likely to be disengaged, which eventually results in effort restraint and withdrawal.

"Engagement" is defined by Shuck and Wollard (2010) as an employee's mental, emotional, and behavioral state with the goal of accomplishing desired organizational outcomes. This concept may be interpreted differently by different scholars and academics (Macey and Schneider, 2008). It could be a psychological state, operational characteristic, or behavioral strategy. Pritchard (2008) states that the following terms are suitable for defining employee engagement: Say (a measure of how employees will portray their own organization), Stay (a measure of employees' loyalty to their organization), and Strive (a measure of employees' willingness to go "over and beyond" their duties to achieve organizational success).

The degree of dedication and involvement an employee has with their company and its principles is generally referred to as employee engagement (Anita, 2014). Bakker (2011) states that the best way to characterize engagement is as a joyful, highly awakened emotional state that possesses the attributes of commitment and energy. As part of their model of employee engagement, Soane et al. (2012) developed three criteria: positive affect, activation, and a work-role focus. Xu et al. (2013) divided employee engagement into four categories: responsibility effectiveness, mental state, work attitude, and organizational identity. The five components of

employee engagement are initiative, loyalty, effectiveness, identity, and commitment, according to Xiao and Duan (2014).

Employee engagement will be altered because it looks that levels of work centrality are dropping and narcissism are increasing. This may be most visible as the younger generation enters the workforce. Employee involvement at high levels is desirable. Employee engagement is defined as a state of mind marked by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). Individual engagement is defined as a favorable condition in which an individual demonstrates high levels of interest, dedication, passion, excitement, concentrated work, and energy (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Employee engagement is linked to higher levels of employee performance and productivity (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Halbesleben, 2010; Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006), higher levels of organizational performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009), and higher levels of employee retention and wellbeing (Halbesleben, 2010; Saks, 2006). An engaged employee expends more discretionary effort, raising both individual and collective performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2003). Work will be more difficult to be highly invested, devoted, and passionate about one's performance and productivity if it is not a high priority, that is, if it is not essential to one's life (work centrality)., According to this, Employee engagement is influenced by the antecedents of job centrality and narcissism.

Employee engagement is associated with positive employee performance and productivity (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Halbesleben, 2010; Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006), positive organizational performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009), and employee retention and wellbeing (Halbesleben, 2010; Saks, 2006). An engaged employee expends more discretionary effort, improving both individual and collective performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2003). If work is not a high priority, meaning it is not central to one's life (work centrality), it will be more difficult to be highly involved, committed, and passionate about one's performance and productivity. Employee engagement is influenced by the antecedents of work centrality and narcissism, according to the researcher.

Numerous authors' studies, including those by Chaudhary and Rangnekar (2017), Coetzee and Rothmann (2005), Hakeem and Gulzar (2015), Jaupi and Llaci (2015), Mahboubi, Ghahramani, Mohammadi, Amani, Mousavi, Moradi, Akbarzadeh, Kazemi (2015), Mostert and Rothmann (2006), Persson (2010), Reissová, Šimsová, and Hášová (2017), Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004), Swaminathan and Ananth (2009), Yadav (2016), and Yildirim (2008) failed to find any statistically significant links between gender and work engagement.

Gender

Gender differentiation among employees has been identified as a significant paradigm of individual difference in numerous studies. The relationship between gender and employee engagement has been the subject of numerous studies. On the relationship between gender and work engagement, however, prior research shows conflicting findings from various authors. Men's and women's engagement levels are not different, according to some recent and historical literature, but few women's engagement levels are high, and vice versa. However, most studies did not find significant differences in respondents' levels of work engagement based on their gender. Due to its lack of practical significance, Schaufeli et al. (2006)'s study on cross-nationals for scale validation took into account a weak and indefinite relationship based on gender and work engagement. Numerous authors' studies, including those by Chaudhary and Rangnekar (2017), Coetzee and Rothmann (2005), Hakeem and Gulzar (2015), Jaupi and Llaci (2015), Mahboubi, Ghahramani, Mohammadi, Amani, Mousavi, Moradi, Akbarzadeh, Kazemi (2015), Mostert and Rothmann (2006), Persson (2010), Reissová, Šimsová, and Hášová (2017), Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004), Swaminathan and Ananth (2009), Yadav (2016), and Yildirim (2008) failed to find any statistically significant links between gender and work engagement.

Furthermore, some studies (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2007; CIPD, 2006; Gulzar & Teli, 2018;

Age

In order to measure employee engagement based on employee age criteria, Schaufeli et al. (2006) studied 14,521 employees across 10 different countries. The findings showed a weak positive correlation (.15 or less) between employee age and work engagement for the entire sample, which was not practically significant. Based on positive correlations found between

employee age and work engagement, Persson (2010) proposed that higher levels of engagement are driven by older employees. Drake (2012) further supported these findings by observing a weak to moderate relationship between employee age and engagement metrics.

The three aspects of work engagement—vigor, dedication, and absorption—were found to differ significantly between the age groups measured by Sharma et al. (2017) (less than 28 years) and (between 28 and 32 years). According to the findings, workers who are 28 years of age or older report higher levels of work engagement than those who are younger. Furthermore, aside from the dimension of absorption, no discernible differences were found between the age groups of less than 28 and over 32 or between the ages of 28 and 32 and over 32. The age of employees was divided into three distinct age groups in Chaudhary and Rangnekar's (2017) study of 404 business executives (333 men and 71 women): under 25, between 25 and 40, and over 40. The findings indicated that there were notable variations in the level of engagement between executives in the 25–40 age range, with executives in this age range reflecting the highest levels of engagement among the under-25, 25–40, and over-40 age groups. The findings revealed notable variations in the engagement metrics of executives across age groups, with those between the ages of 25 and 40 exhibiting a higher level of work-related absorption than those under 25. They clarified that workers under 25 are particularly prone to changing jobs and placed more emphasis on opportunities for personal growth and development than stability. Conversely, a study by Avery et al. (2007) that involved 901 UK workers found that employee age and engagement showed an inverse relationship, meaning that an employee's level of engagement falls as their age rises. Compared to younger employees, older employees are less engaged.

Furthermore, according to Robinson et al. (2007), employee engagement levels are likely to be higher when they are younger (less than 20 years old) and also rise as they get older. While the middle-aged group (30–39 years old) showed constant levels of engagement, the oldest age group of employees (over 60 years old) also displayed elevated levels. The generational cohort or group of employees also reveals variations in the level of work engagement (Hlongwane & Ledimo, 2015).

Years of Work Experience

According to Maslach and Leiter (2008) and Mohapatra and Sharma (2010), years of work experience are a demographic variable that is associated with employee engagement. However,

Madan and Srivastava (2015) did not consider years of experience as a significant variable to predict employees' level of engagement, and Albdour and Altarawneh (2014) did not support tenure as a significant factor for differences in employee engagement. However, Mahboubi et al. (2015) recently acknowledged in their study that employee work experience and work engagement have a significant relationship.

A few previous authors (Buckingham, 2001; Robinson et al., 2004) described a reciprocal relationship between an employee's engagement levels and the amount of time they spend with the company. The degree of employee engagement declines as years of work experience increase. Furthermore, according to Avery et al. (2007), employees with longer tenure (as determined by three criteria: organizational tenure, manager tenure, and positional tenure) have lower engagement scores than those with shorter positional tenure.

Robinson et al. (2007) found that employee engagement levels typically begin at a high level, gradually decline to a low point after a few years of service, and then rise again with a longer service tenure (tenure > 15 years). Furthermore, based on the range of experiences that the company offers, Robinson et al. (2007) suggested that the degree of employee engagement does change with the length of time an employee has worked there. During the first six months of employment, new hires' levels of engagement peak. Accordingly, during this "honeymoon" phase, companies increase and prolong these workers' engagement (Robison, 2015).

Designation in Organizational Hierarchy

In their 2007 study, Avery et al. found that top-ranking executives and supervisors had higher work engagement scores than lower-ranking staff members. Furthermore, Robinson et al. (2007) found that employee engagement was lowest among back-end staff with lower-level positions and highest among senior positions acquired by managers. As a consulting firm, Blessing White (2008) acknowledged that employee engagement levels varied depending on their position within the organization's hierarchy, confirming that top management was more engaged than lower-level employees. In general, professional staff members and managers are more engaged than their colleagues in supporting roles (Scottish executive, 2007).

A small number of authors have previously found a positive relationship between employee work engagement and the level of an employee's position in the organizational hierarchy

(Business World, 2008; Kahn, 1990; Robinson et al., 2004; Xu & Cooper-Thomas, 2011). They succinctly stated that the privilege of authority and voting power allows the employees in higher positions to significantly and meaningfully drive the company. They are able to express themselves and show a greater level of involvement with their work and organization as a result. Vanam (2009) found a positive correlation between job engagement and organizational hierarchy designation. They also found that employees will be more engaged at work if they have a higher level of designation within their organization.

Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted to have a comprehensive perspective to measure employee engagement based on the demographic characteristics of the employees, given the field of human resource management research. The study's main goal was to examine how certain demographic factors affected the degree of employee engagement.

1. To assess the level of employee engagement in the higher educational Institutes of Delhi/NCR
2. To study the effect of gender diversity on the level of employee engagement.
3. To study the effect employee's age diversity on the level of employee engagement.
4. To study the effect of employee's years of work experience diversity on the level of employee engagement.
5. To study the effect of employee's position diversity in the organizational hierarchy on the level of employee engagement.

Research Methodology

The first section of the instrument gathered information about the demographic profile of the respondents that included gender, age, and region of origin, highest grade of education, work experience, designation and religion. Employee Engagement is measured on the scale adapted from Lenka. This section sought to identify whether these demographic variables had any effect on various factors of employee engagement. i.e., Physical engagement, Cognitive engagement, behavioral engagement and emotional engagement.

Gender had only two options thus, researcher used the two-sample independent t-test on this variable, while age, region of origin, religion, work experience and designation of the respondents had more than three options, hence the researcher has used the one-way ANOVA on

these variables, to measure the differences in the mean values of employee engagement of respondents within each category.

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant impact of gender diversity on employee engagement of faculty members in

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant impact of various religion diversity on employee engagement on faculty members of various religions.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant impact of age diversity on employee engagement on faculty members .

Hypothesis 4 : There is a significant impact of work experience diversity on Employee engagement on faculty members .

Hypothesis 5 : There is a significant impact of qualification diversity on Employee engagement on faculty members .

Hypothesis 6 : There is a significant impact of diversity on Employee engagement on faculty members .

Research Analysis

Data Collection

The data for the study has been collected for seven to eight months from Sep'2019 to Mar'2020.As Covid was spreading so data has been collected through google form shared on different WhatsApp groups, formal mail ids and faculty members. The data from 500 faculty members has been collected, out of which 447 entries had been found suitable for the further analysis.

Analysis of the Data

Data Analysis The statistical analysis was carried out with the help of statistical software SPSS 20. Descriptive and inferential statistics methods were used to analyze the data. Statistical techniques including T-test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), post hoc tests, and correlation analysis were used to draw results.

The behavioral engagement between male and female faculties has been calculated using T-test.

It can be inferred from the Table 1, the mean value of behavioral engagement for females was 3.80 while for the males it was 3.74. Thus, it can be said that the female faculty members had higher behavioral engagement than male faculty members. Further, the t-test revealed a value of (0.28) is more than the standard significance level of 0.05, We can accept the null hypothesis.

Our sample data does not support the hypothesis that the population mean is different. so, we concluded that there is difference in behavioral engagement between male and female faculty members of Higher Educational Institutes of Delhi/NCR.

Table 1: Comparison of behavioral Engagement among Different Genders						
Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	t- value	Sig
Gender	Female	197	3.80	0.163	-1.06	0.28
	Male	247	3.74	0.134		

*Significant at .05 level

Further, the t-test revealed a value of -1.067, ($p = 0.021$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 per cent level of significance). Hence, a significant difference exists in work engagement between male and female faculty members.

Table 2: Comparison of Cognitive Engagement among Different Genders						
Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	t- value	Sig
Gender	Female	197	4.15	0.39	1.04	0.29
	Male	247	4.21	0.46		

*Significant at .05 level

It can be inferred from the Table 2, the mean value of cognitive engagement for females was 4.15 while for the males it was 4.21. Thus, it can be said that the male faculty members had higher cognitive engagement than female faculty members. Further, the t-test revealed a value of (0.29) which is more than the standard significance level of 0.05, the researcher can accept the null hypothesis. The researcher sample data does not support the hypothesis that the population mean is different so the researcher concluded that there is no difference in cognitive engagement between male and female faculty member of Higher Educational Institutes of Delhi/NCR.

Table 3: Comparison of Physical Engagement among Different Genders						
Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	t- value	Sig
Gender	Female	197	3.91	0.33	-0.23	0.81
	Male	247	3.90	0.34		

*Significant at .05 level

It can be inferred from the Table 3, the mean value of Physical engagement for females was 3.91

while for the males it was 3.90. Thus, it can be said that the male faculty members had comparatively higher physical engagement than male faculty members. Further, the t-test revealed a value of (-0.23) which is more than the standard significance level of 0.05, the researcher can accept the null hypothesis. The researcher sample data does not support the hypothesis that the population mean is different. The researcher concluded that there is no difference in physical engagement between male and female faculty member of Higher Educational Institutes of Delhi/NCR.

Table 4: Comparison of Emotional Engagement among Different Genders

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	t- value	Sig
Gender	Female	197	3.31	0.19	1.92	0.05
	Male	247	3.40	0.24		

*Significant at .05 level

It can be inferred from the Table 4, the mean value of emotional engagement for females was 3.31 while for the male

s it was 3.40. Thus, it can be said that the male faculty members had comparatively higher emotional engagement than female faculty members. Further, the t-test revealed a value of (0.05) which is equal to the standard significance level of 0.05. The researcher can reject the null hypothesis. The researcher sample data does support the hypothesis that the population mean is different so the researcher concluded that there is no difference in emotional engagement between male and female faculty member of Higher Educational Institutes of Delhi/NCR.

Table 5: Comparison of Hindu employee among different types of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	177	3.36	0.48	122.59	0.00
	Physical	177	3.91	0.58		
	Cognitive	177	4.16	0.67		
	Behaviorial	177	3.79	0.62		

It can be inferred from the Table 5, the mean value of cognitive engagement among Hindus found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 65.42 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a

significant difference in Hindu religion among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 6: Comparison of Muslim faculty members among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	29	3.49	0.44	12.41	0.00
	Physical	29	3.83	0.57		
	Cognitive	29	4.26	0.52		
	Behaviorial	29	3.57	0.58		

It can be inferred from the Table 6, the mean value of cognitive engagement among Muslims found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 12.41 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in Muslim religion among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 7: Comparison of Sikhs faculty members among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	7	3.49	0.23	8.39	0.00
	Physical	7	3.83	0.69		
	Cognitive	7	4.26	0.42		
	Behaviorial	7	3.57	0.78		

It can be inferred from the Table 7, the mean value of cognitive engagement among Muslims faculty members found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 8.39 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in Sikh religion among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 8: Comparison of Christian faculty members among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	15	3.43	0.58		
	Physical	15	4.08	0.65		

	Cognitive	15	4.45	0.71	6.49	0.00
	Behaviorial	15	3.87	0.64		

It can be inferred from the Table 8, the mean value of cognitive engagement among Muslims found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 6.49 Table 4.9: Comparison of Christian employee among different types of employee engagement (0.00, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in Christian religion among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR

Table 9: Comparison of faculty members (any other religion then Hindu, Muslims, Sikhs & Christian) among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	10	3.15	0.45	6.32	0.00
	Physical	10	3.85	0.65		
	Cognitive	10	4.28	0.62		
	Behaviorial	10	3.73	0.60		

It can be inferred from the Table 9, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty member of any religion other than Hindu, Muslim and Sikh found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 6.32 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in any other religion among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR

Table 10: Comparison of graduate faculty members among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	16	3.28	0.57	3.45	0.02
	Physical	16	3.73	0.62		
	Cognitive	16	3.91	0.59		
	Behaviorial	16	3.83	0.64		

It can be inferred from the Table 10, the mean value of cognitive engagement among Graduate faculty member found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 3.45 ($p = 0.02$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in graduate faculty members among various factors of

engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 11: Comparison of Post graduate faculty members among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	104	3.40	0.41	42.62	0.00
	Physical	104	3.95	0.53		
	Cognitive	104	4.22	0.54		
	Behaviorial	104	3.86	0.63		

It can be inferred from the Table 11, the mean value of cognitive engagement among Post graduate faculty member found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 42.62 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in graduate faculty members among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 12: Comparison of PhD faculty members among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	104	3.27	0.44	45.80	0.00
	Physical	104	3.90	0.63		
	Cognitive	104	4.21	0.68		
	Behavioral	104	3.71	0.60		

It can be inferred from the Table 12, the mean value of cognitive engagement among PhD faculty member found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 45.80 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in PhD faculty members among various factors of engagement in faculty members of Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 13: Comparison of faculty members aged above 50 years among different factors of employee engagement						
Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	35	3.11	0.43	35.74	0.00
	Physical	35	4.08	0.67		
	Cognitive	35	4.36	0.50		
	Behavioral	35	4.04	0.52		

It can be inferred from the Table 14, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members aged above 50 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 35.74 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members aged above 50 among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 14: Comparison of faculty members aged between 41- 50 years among different factors of employee engagement						
Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	88	3.25	0.45	54.64	0.00
	Physical	88	4.03	0.59		
	Cognitive	88	4.29	0.62		
	Behavioral	88	3.94	0.58		

It can be inferred from the Table 13, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members aged between 41-50 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 54.64 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members aged between 41-50 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 15: Comparison of faculty members aged between 31- 40 years among different factors of employee engagement						
Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	77	3.36	0.42	29.97	0.00
	Physical	77	3.94	0.49		
	Cognitive	77	4.13	0.63		
	Behavioral	77	3.78	0.54		

It can be inferred from the Table 14, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members aged between 31-40 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 29.97 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members aged between 31-40 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 16: Comparison of faculty members aged between 41- 50 among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	75	3.38	0.45	20.70	0.00
	Physical	75	3.82	0.59		
	Cognitive	75	4.10	0.62		
	Behavioral	75	3.74	0.58		

It can be inferred from the Table 16, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members aged between 41-50 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 20.70 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members aged between 21-30 among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

It can be inferred from the Table 16, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members experience between 1-2 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 11.77 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members

Table 17: Comparison of faculty members experience between 1-2 years among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	47	3.45	0.42	11.77	0.00
	Physical	47	3.75	0.57		
	Cognitive	47	4.08	0.53		
	Behavioral	47	3.70	0.54		

experience between 1-2 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 18: Comparison of faculty members experience between 3-5 years among different factors of employee engagement

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
Employee Engagement	Emotional	118	3.38	0.40	40.95	0.00
	Physical	118	3.88	0.58		
	Cognitive	118	4.15	0.55		
	Behaviorial	118	3.70	0.64		

It can be inferred from the Table 4.19, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members experience between 3-5 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 40.95 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members experience between 3-5 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 19: Comparison of faculty members experience between 6-10 years among different factors of employee engagement

Item	**Category**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F value**	**Sig.**
Employee Engagement	Emotional	97	3.45	0.47	26.28	0.00
	Physical	97	3.94	0.55		
	Cognitive	97	4.13	0.58		
	Behaviorial	97	3.81	0.62		

It can be inferred from the Table 16, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members experience between 6-10 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 26.28 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members experience between 6-10 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 20: Comparison of faculty members experience between 10-15 years among different factors of employee engagement						
Item	**Category**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F value**	**Sig.**
Employee Engagement	Emotional	71	3.49	0.57	26.28	0.00
	Physical	71	3.95	0.50		
	Cognitive	71	4.38	0.57		
	Behaviorial	71	3.83	0.53		

It can be inferred from the Table 17, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members experience between 10-15 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 26.28 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members experience between 10-15 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Table 21: Comparison of faculty members experience more than 15 years among different factors of employee engagement						
Item	**Category**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**F value**	**Sig.**
Employee Engagement	Emotional	111	3.17	0.46	45.24	0.00
	Physical	111	3.96	0.67		
	Cognitive	111	4.20	0.87		
	Behaviorial	111	3.82	0.69		

It can be inferred from the Table 21, the mean value of cognitive engagement among faculty members experiences more than 15 years found to be the highest. Further, the F test revealed that the value of F-test was 45.24 ($p = 0.00$, $p < 0.05$, significant at 5 percent level of significance). Hence, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference in faculty members experience more than 15 years among various factors of engagement in Higher Educational Institutions in Delhi/NCR.

Findings of the study

The analysis of demographic data results that:

1. Female faculty members had higher behaviorial engagement than male faculty members.
2. Male faculty members had higher cognitive engagement than female faculty members.

3. Male faculty members had higher physical engagement than female faculty members.
4. Male faculty members had higher emotional engagement than female faculty members.
5. People from different religions i.e., Hindu, Muslims, Sikhs, Christian and other religion faculty members are more cognitively engaged than physical, emotional & behaviorial engagement.
6. Faculty members who are PhD, Post-graduate, graduate is all more cognitively engaged than physical, emotional & behavioral engagement.
7. Faculty members aged above 50 years, aged between 41-50 years, 31-40 years and 21-30 years are all more cognitively engaged than physical, emotional & behavioral engagement.
8. Faculty members having experience of more than 2 years, more than 5 years, more than 10 years and above 15 years are all more cognitively engaged than physical, emotional & behavioral engagement.

Hence, here the researcher concludes that teaching faculty members in HEI's in Delhi/NCR are more cognitively engaged than physical, emotional & behavioral engagement.

Discussion

This investigation revealed that employee engagement was significantly impacted by ethnic diversity. The study by Ehimare & Ogaga-Oghene (2011), which claimed that demographic aspects of workplace diversity enable management to arrange work based on adaptability, creativity, and speedy decision-making opportunities inherent in a collaborative environment, supports this conclusion. Diversity in the workplace so indicates to management a greater capacity to comprehend how employees interact with businesses. Ivancevich & Gilbert (2001) also discovered that if there is a higher level of workforce diversity, both majority and minority groups will feel more attached to their firms.

Indeed, companies that support multiculturalism tend to have more explicitly attached employees. (Griffin A. & M. Ivancevich, 2011). According to Milliken and Martins (1996), diversity can impact an organization's performance through a variety of mediating factors. Saks (2006) claims that social exchange theory (SET) offers a more convincing theoretical justification for understanding employee engagement. According to SET, a succession of contacts between parties that are mutually dependent on one another result in responsibilities. A

fundamental tenet of SET is that, provided both parties follow certain guidelines for communication, relationships gradually develop into ones characterized by mutual commitment, loyalty, and trust.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Various diversity factors such as age, religion, language and gender significantly impact employee engagement of faculty members in HEI's in Delhi/NCR. The analysis carried out also showed that to a great extent that ethnic diversity is an important prerequisite to achieve employee engagement. The paper recommended that good employee ethnic diversity management by the firm is a good way of achieving better engagement by the employees. Management should properly allocate responsibilities to all employees based on merit irrespective of the person's ethnic background.

References

1. Akinnusi, David M., Olubukunola O. Sonubi, and Adebukola E. Oyewunmi. "Fostering effective workforce diversity management in Nigerian organizations: The challenge of Human Resource Management." *International Review of Management and Marketing* 7.2 (2017): 108-116.
2. Ehimare, O. A., & Ogaga-Oghene, J. O. (2011). The impact of workforce diversity on organizational effectiveness: a study of a Nigerian bank. *Annals of the University of Petrosan. Economics*, *11*, 93-110.
3. Guadagno, L. (2020). Migrants and the COVID-19 pandemic: An initial analysis.
4. Gilbert, J. A., & Ivancevich, J. M. (2001). Effects of diversity management on attachment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(7), 1331-1349.
5. Harrison, D.A., & Klein, K.J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety or disparity in organizations. The Academy of Management review, 32(4), 1199-1228.
6. Itam, U., & Bagali, M. M. (2019). Diversity and inclusion management: a focus on employee engagement. In *Gender and Diversity: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1771-1788). IGI Global.
7. Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K. (1995). Dynamics of Diversity in Decision-Making Teams. Team Effectiveness and Decision Making in Organizations, December, 204–26
8. Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K. (1995). Dynamics of Diversity in Decision-Making Teams. Team Effectiveness and Decision Making in Organizations, December, 204–26
9. International Journal of Economic, Business and Management Research, 1(2), 23-38.
10. Jauhari, H., & Singh, S. (2013). Perceived diversity climate and employees' organizational loyalty. Journal Equity, Diversity & Inclusion, 32(3), 262-276.

11. Kumar, A. (2016). Redefined and importance of organizational culture. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, *16*(4), 14-18.
12. Kahn, W.A. (1990), Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Academy of Management Journal, 33. 692-724 [11]
13. Kaur, S. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: A literature review. IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16(3), 7-32. [12]
14. Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. Administrative science quarterly, 9, 370-390. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391032
15. Li S & Chanchai B (2019). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review, International Journal of Human Resource Studies, Macrothink Institute, (1) 63-80, December.
16. Markos, S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. International Journal of Business Management, 5(12), 89.
17. Moore, T. and Ward, K., (2010). Institutionalizing Faculty Engagement through Research, Teaching, and Service at Research Universities. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. Fall. 44-58
18. Nagoji, A., Mackasare, S. (2022). Faculty Engagement at Higher Education Institutes: A Conceptual Framework. International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies, 13(3), 13A3U, 1-11. http://TUENGR.COM/V13/13A3U.pdf DOI: 10.14456/ITJEMAST.2022.63
19. Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of management review*, *21*(2), 402-433.
20. Prause, D., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). Conflict management practices for diverse workplaces. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, *6*(3), 13.
21. Rijamampianina, R., & Carmichael, T. (2005). A pragmatic and holistic approach to managing diversity. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 3(1), 109–117.
22. Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of managerial psychology, 21(7), 600-619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169
23. Salminen, S. R., Mäkikangas, A., & Feldt, T. (2014). Job resources and work engagement: Optimism as moderator among Finnish managers. Journal of European psychology students, 5(1), 69-77. https://doi.org/10.5334/jeps.bu
24. Selmer, J., Jonasson, C. and Lauring, J. (2014), Knowledge processing and faculty engagement in multicultural university settings: a social learning perspective, Journal of Further and Higher Education, 2. 211-229.
25. Shuck, B. and Wollard, K. (2010), Employee engagement & HRD: a seminal review of the foundations, Human Resource Development Review. 89-110
26. Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. Harvard business review, 74(5), 79-90.
27. Umemezia, E., & Agbonifoh, B. (2017). Culturally diverse workforce and performance in Nigerian Public Service: Issues and challenges in people's management context. International Journal of Economic, Business and Management Research, 1(2), 23-38.
28. Nagoji, A., Mackasare, S. (2022). Faculty Engagement at Higher Education Institutes: A Conceptual Framework. International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies, 13(3), 13A3U, 1-11. http://TUENGR.COM/V13/13A3U.pdf DOI: 10.14456/ITJEMAST.2022.63
29. Kahn, W.A. (1990), Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Academy of Management Journal, 33. 692-724 [11]
30. Kaur, S. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement: A literature review. IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16(3), 7-32. [12]

31. Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. Administrative science quarterly, 9, 370-390. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391032
32. [13] Li S & Chanchai B (2019). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review, International Journal of Human Resource Studies, Macrothink Institute, (1) 63-80, December.
33. Xu, L., Guo, Y. J., & Wang, Y. (2013). Empirical research on engagement structure of manufacturing employees based on structural equation modeling. Management World, 6,59-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.13529/j.cnki.enterprise.economy.2013.06.002