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## CHAPTER VI

## PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS - AN ASSESSMENT

Higher education is connected with academic activities of the teachers, student, administration, research work and financial support by the government. The most important apprehension in education can be taken as quality, relevance and quality of education service. Performance is a continuing, collaborative process designed to boost the teachers' capability and productivity. Performance is a goal-oriented process directed towards organizational development in a position to augment of teachers, teams and organizational productivity.

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of Performance Assessment of the teachers working in engineering colleges. Different factors of Performance Assessment have been analyzed for possible significant difference among the groups of selected demographic/ job related factors and academic related variables. The mean scores for each factor were computed by using descriptive statistics. The mean scores will indicate the level of performance for each factor. Higher the score more will be the performance of the respective factor. Statistical analysis has been carried out for each factor separately and inferences have been drawn. Analysis carried out in this chapter are Descriptive statistics, Chi-Square, t-Test, ANOVA, Correlation and Regression.

Objective-3: To assess the performance of engineering teachers based on assessment score

## Performance Assessment

The Performance assessment scores are prescribed by the UGC has been considered for calculating the performance of teachers in engineering colleges. The Questionnaire is framed by self-evaluative indicators. The indicators selected from UGC Academic performance indicators (API). The process of Academic performance index (API) or performance assessment system has been introduced to calculate the performance of the teachers. Performance assessment indicators are presented in the following table.

Table: 6.1 Performance Assessment Scale (Count of work done from 2015-2019)

| S. <br> No. | Particulars | Total (Scores) |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Publication in refereed journals | $10 /$ Publication |
| 2. | Publication in Scopus index online/printed | $25 /$ Publication |
| 3. | Text books or Reference Books Published by International <br> Publishers | $30 /$ Book |
| 4. | Subjects Books by National level publishers/ Central Govt. <br> Publications with ISBN/ISSN numbers. | 29/Publication |
| 5. | Chapters contributed to edited knowledge based volumes <br> published by International Publishers | $10 /$ Chapter |
| 6. | Chapters in knowledge based vol by Indian/National level <br> books. | $5 /$ Chapter |
| 7. | Completed project report which is accepted by funding agency | $20 /$ Project |
| 8. | Industrial visits arranged by you to manufacturing industry | $15 /$ Iv |
| 9. | Project concepts eligible for product development got accepted <br> by manufacturers/company. | $25 /$ project |
| 10. | Major Projects amount mobilized with grants above5.0 lakhs | $15 /$ project |
| 11. | MinorProjects Amount mobilized uptoRs.5.00 lacks | $10 /$ project |
| 12. | Online courses completed (if any) | $5 /$ Project |
| 13. | Faculty internship completed (If any) | $10 /$ work |
| 14. | Research Guidance | M.Phil. |


| S. <br> No. | Particulars | Total (Scores) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TRAINING COURSES AND CONFERENCE /SEMINAR/ WORKSHOP PAPERS |  |  |  |
| 15. | Soft skills programs, faculty development programs attendedless <br> than a week | 7 |  |
|  | Soft skills development programs, faculty development <br> programs attended more than a week | Participated | Presented |
| 17. | Participation in conferences |  | a)International conference |
|  | b)National conference | 5 | 7 |
|  | c)Regional/State level | 3 | 5 |
| 18. |  <br> conference | $7 /$ Int | $5 /$ Nat |
|  | Awards received(International/national) | $15 /$ Int $10 /$ Nat |  |
| 20. | Number the Membership in other professional bodies | 16 |  |
| 21. | Development of e-learning module(How many modules are <br> given by you) | $8 /$ Module |  |

Source: Scores For Academic Performance Indicators (APIs) In Recruitments and Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) Promotions Of University / College Teachers as per UGC regulations.

## Academic Performance Indicators (API)

The scores are taken from the Academic Performance Indicators [In Recruitments and Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) Promotions of University / College Teachers as per UGC regulations].

* Each indicator of the performance appraisal is taken according to the current academic basis, which is followed in few of the institutions.
* The changes with the category and statements have been made for the convenience of the respondents.
* Where as in regard to valuation of papers and invigilation of institutions are paid then and there, those were not included in the table of Performance assessment.

According to the UGC's Academic performance index the total score of all the four categories. And for the relevance of the current study the multiples of the score is taken for calculating the five years academic performance.

The performance assessment index is including four different categories, such as, Category I, II, III and IV. The details of each category and the items included in each category are given below.

Table 6.2. Academic Performance Indicators (API)

| S. No. | Nature of Activity | Questions Representing |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1. | Category I (Teaching, Learning, \& evaluation <br> related activities) | Q9 to Q13, Q15 \& Q16 |
| 2. | Category II (Co-Curricular, Extension and <br> Professional Development Related Activities) | Q8, Q18, Q19, Q20, Q21 |
| 3. | Category-III (Research \& Academic Contributions) | Q14 \& Q17 |
| 4. | Category- IV (Research articles, publications, <br> research work) | Q1 to Q7 |

Source: Scores for Academic Performance Indicators (APIS) In Recruitments and Career Advancement Scheme (CAS)

The Performance Assessment score is given for each question and according to the scores the individual capacity to contribute is calculated and however, for the present study, according to weights assigned for each activity and each category overall performance score has been calculated based on the sum of the number of activities with respective weights that is given in the Performance Index table.

## Descriptive Statistics for Performance Assessment Category Scores

Performance is based on individual's capacity to contribute for different aspects. The present study, the weights have been assigned for each activity and each category score and overall performance score has been calculated based on the sum of the number of activities multiplied respective weights given in the Performance Index table. Based on
the API given in table 6.1 individual scores have been calculated to measure the performance of teachers refer (Annexure II) for individual score. Based on individual assessment, overall performance assessment score are calculated. Overall scores for each category is given below.

Table 6.3. Descriptive Statistics for Performance Assessment Category Scores

|  | $\mathbf{N}$ | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category I score | 400 | 47.00 | 356.00 | 183.75 | 63.78 |
| Category II score | 400 | 22.00 | 158.00 | 81.67 | 28.35 |
| Category IV score | 400 | 46.00 | 348.00 | 179.67 | 62.36 |
| Category IV score | 400 | 43.00 | 325.00 | 167.42 | 58.11 |
| Performance Assessment | 400 | 158.00 | 1187.00 | 612.52 | 212.59 |

## Source: Primary Data

It is observed from the above table that, the category I score (Teaching, Learning and evaluation) varies between minimum of 47 to maximum of 356 . The average category I score is 183.75 . The result shows that there is high variation in performance of Category I activity there is various differences between minimum and maximum scores.

In the case of Category II (Co-Curricular, Extension and Professional Development Related Activities) it is observed that, the value varies between minimum of 22 to maximum of 158 . The average category II score is 81.67 . The result shows that there is high variation in performance of Category II activity there is various differences between minimum and maximum scores.

In the case of Category III (Research \& Academic Contributions) it is observed that, the value varies between minimum of 46 to maximum of 348 . The average category III score is 179.67 . The result shows that there is high variation in performance of Category III activity there is various differences between minimum and maximum scores.

In the case of Category IV (Research articles, publications, research work) it is observed that, the values varies between minimum of 43 to maximum of 325 .

The average category IV score is 167.42 . The result shows that there is high variation in performance of Category IV activity there is various differences between minimum and maximum scores.

In the case of overall Performance assessment, it is observed that, the value varies between minimum of 158 to maximum of 1187. The average score is 612.52 . The result shows that there is high variation in the overall performance assessment so it results that there is various differences between minimum and maximum scores.

The performance scores of all the four categories and overall performance assessment of the respondents have been grouped into three classifications namely Low, Moderate and High. For this purpose, the (Mean $\pm 0.5$ S.D) classification procedure has been followed.

The respondents whose scores (category wise as well as overall performance) fall below the value of (Mean-0.5SD) have been grouped into Low performer for the particular category and the respondents whose scores fall above the value of (Mean +0.5 SD) have been classified into High performers in the respective category. The respondents whose scores fall between (Mean-0.5SD) and (mean+0.5SD) have been classified as Moderate performers.

In the case of Category I , it is seen from the table given above that the mean and S.D values are 183.75 and 63.78 respectively. The Mean-0.5SD and Mean+0.05SD values are calculated below.

Low $=$ Mean-0.05SD $=183.75-(0.5 \times 63.78)=152($ rounded off $)$
High $=$ Mean +0.05 SD $=183.75+(0.5 \times 63.78)=216($ rounded off $)$
The cut off values for Low and High are 152 and 216 respectively.
The respondents whose scores fall below 152 will be classified as low performers and the respondents whose scores fall at and above 216 will be classified as high performers and the respondents with scores falling between 152 and 216 is considered as Moderate performers. In the same manner low, moderate and high score is calculated for the other categories and for overall performance assessment.

## Category wise Performance of the Respondents

Based on the above table category wise performances of the respondents are given in the following table.

Table 6.4. Category wise Performance of the Respondents

|  |  | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Category II | Low (<=151) | 158 | 39.5 |
|  | Moderate (152-216) | 94 | 23.5 |
|  | High(>=217) | 148 | 37.0 |
|  | Low (<=66) | 142 | 35.5 |
|  | Moderate (67-96) | 111 | 27.8 |
|  | High(>=97) | 147 | 36.8 |
| Category IV | Low (<=147) | 151 | 37.8 |
|  | Moderate (148-211) | 124 | 31.0 |
|  | High(>=212) | 125 | 31.3 |
| Performance Assessment | Low $(<=137)$ | 174 | 43.5 |
|  | $\operatorname{Moderate~(138-196)~}$ | 101 | 25.3 |
|  | $\operatorname{High}(>=197)$ | 125 | 31.3 |
|  | Low $(<=505)$ | 163 | 40.8 |
|  | $\operatorname{High}(>=720)$ | 100 | 25.0 |

Source: Primary data
It is observed from the above table that 39.5 percent of the respondents are low performers with respect to category I followed by 37.0 percent of the respondents are high performers. Only 23.5 percent of the respondents are found in the moderate level.

Regarding Category II 36.8 percent of respondents fall under high performing category and 35.5 of the per cent respondents are categorized under low performing category.

With respect to Category III 37.8 per cent of the respondents fall under the category low and equal percent of respondents fall under moderate and high performing category (31.3\%).

In case of Category IV 43.5 per cent of the teachers fall under low performing category, 31.3 percent are fall under high performing category and 25.3 per cent of the respondents categorize under moderate performing level.

The overall performance assessment score results shows that, 40.8 per cent of the teachers fall under low performing category, 34.3 per cent fall under high performing category and 25.0 per cent are categorized under moderate performing level.

## Performance of Teachers in Working in Engineering Colleges

The scores of each factor have compared among the group of selected job related factors and performance assessment category. The mean scores are calculated by descriptive statistics and to determine the significance of the factors $t$-test, ANOVA and Chi square analysis have been applied.

## Distribution for Job related factors Vs Performance Assessment Category I

Chi square test for Job related factors and performance assessment category I wise distribution is presented in the following table.

Table 6.5. Distribution for Category I Scores Vs Selected Job-Related Factors

|  | Category I score |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low |  | Moderate |  | High |  | No. | \% |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |
| Designation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor | 37 | 28.9 | 27 | 21.1 | 64 | 50.0 | 128 | 100 |
| Associate Professor | 49 | 47.1 | 21 | 20.2 | 34 | 32.7 | 104 | 100 |
| Assistant Professor | 72 | 42.9 | 46 | 27.4 | 50 | 29.8 | 168 | 100 |
| Pay scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to Rs. 20000 | 11 | 36.7 | 7 | 23.3 | 12 | 40.0 | 30 | 100 |
| Rs.20001-40000 | 69 | 43.4 | 36 | 22.6 | 54 | 34.0 | 159 | 100 |
| Rs.40001-60000 | 50 | 38.5 | 29 | 22.3 | 51 | 39.2 | 130 | 100 |
| Rs.60001-80000 | 13 | 40.6 | 9 | 28.1 | 10 | 31.3 | 32 | 100 |
| Rs.80001-100000 | 4 | 18.2 | 7 | 31.8 | 11 | 50.0 | 22 | 100 |
| Above Rs. 100000 | 11 | 40.7 | 6 | 22.2 | 10 | 37.0 | 27 | 100 |


|  | Category I score |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low |  | Moderate |  | High |  | No. | \% |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |
| Teaching Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 5 yrs | 21 | 50.0 | 7 | 16.7 | 14 | 33.3 | 42 | 100 |
| 6-10 yrs | 42 | 47.7 | 22 | 25.0 | 24 | 27.3 | 88 | 100 |
| 11-15 yrs | 37 | 35.2 | 26 | 24.8 | 42 | 40.0 | 105 | 100 |
| 16-20 yrs | 23 | 35.9 | 13 | 20.3 | 28 | 43.8 | 64 | 100 |
| 21-25 yrs | 18 | 32.1 | 14 | 25.0 | 24 | 42.9 | 56 | 100 |
| Above 25 yrs | 17 | 37.8 | 12 | 26.7 | 16 | 35.6 | 45 | 100 |
| Type of management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aided | 24 | 36.4 | 18 | 27.3 | 24 | 36.4 | 66 | 100 |
| Self-finance | 120 | 39.5 | 68 | 22.4 | 116 | 38.2 | 304 | 100 |
| Government | 14 | 46.7 | 8 | 26.7 | 8 | 26.7 | 30 | 100 |
| Total | 158 | 39.5 | 94 | 23.5 | 148 | 37.0 | 400 | 100.0 |

Source: Primary data
The table gives the distribution of category I scores among selected job related factors. It is observed that among the respondents 50 percent of the professors are found to be high performing category. 47.1 percent of the associate professors and 42.9 percent of the assistant professors are fall under low performing category.

In the case of Pay Scale, the teachers who are earning up to Rs.20000, Rs.40001-60000 and Rs.80001-100000 are fall under high performing category. The teachers earning between Rs.20001-40000, Rs. 60001-80000 and Above Rs. 100000 are fall under low performing category

With respect to teaching experience the teachers having experience between 11-15 years; $16-20$ years and 21-25 years are fall under high performing category. The teachers who have experience up to 5 years, 5-10 years and above 25 years are fall under low performing category.

It is seen that among the respondents from aided colleges, 36.4 percent are low performers and 36.4 percent are high performers. Among self-finance institutions 39.5 percent and 38.2 percent belong to Low and High performance groups. However,
in the case of Government colleges, percentage of low performers are high (46.7\%) and only $26.7 \%$ of the respondents from government institutions are high performers

In order to find whether the category I scores are significantly associated with job related factors, such as, designation, pay scale, teaching experience and type of management chi square test has been applied the following hypothesis has been framed and tested.

Ho. There is no significant association between Job related factors and performance assessment category I score.

Table 6.5 (a). Performance Assessment Category I Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Chi-Square Test |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | Table Value | df | Sig. |
| Designation | 16.266 | 13.277 | 4 | $* *$ |
| Pay scale | 6.281 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Teaching Experience | 9.673 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Type of Management | 2.231 | 9.488 | 4 | Ns |

## Source: Primary Data

The chi-square test has been applied to verify the hypothesis. Since the calculated value is less than the table value it is inferred that there is no significant association between Pay scale, Teaching Experience, Type of management with Category I score. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. In the case of Designation, the calculated value is more than the table value it is inferred that there is a significant association with Category I score at $1 \%$ significant level. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected in this case.

The result shows that, the teachers in the professor designation are fall under high performing category and they are performing better than other designation teachers. With respect to experience of the teachers who are having less experience and those who are having more than 25 years fall under low performing category when compare to other groups. Regarding the type of management the teachers working under self financing management are performing well when compare to aided college teachers.

The result also reveals that, there is a strong association between designation and performance of the teachers. The teachers who are Professors are found to be in high performing category.

## Distribution for Category II Scores Vs Selected Job Related Factors

Chi square test for Job related factors and performance assessment category II wise distribution is presented in the following table.

Table 6.6. Distribution for Category II Scores Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Category II Score |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low } \\ (<=66) \end{gathered}$ |  | Moderate(67-96) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { High } \\ (>=97) \end{gathered}$ |  | No. | \% |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |
| Designation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor | 34 | 26.6 | 30 | 23.4 | 64 | 50.0 | 128 | 100.0 |
| Associate Professor | 45 | 43.3 | 25 | 24.0 | 34 | 32.7 | 104 | 100.0 |
| Assistant Professor | 63 | 37.5 | 56 | 33.3 | 49 | 29.2 | 168 | 100.0 |
| Pay scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to Rs. 20000 | 9 | 30.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 12 | 40.0 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Rs.20001-40000 | 61 | 38.4 | 44 | 27.7 | 54 | 34.0 | 159 | 100.0 |
| Rs.40001-60000 | 46 | 35.4 | 33 | 25.4 | 51 | 39.2 | 130 | 100.0 |
| Rs.60001-80000 | 12 | 37.5 | 11 | 34.4 | 9 | 28.1 | 32 | 100.0 |
| Rs.80001-100000 | 4 | 18.2 | 7 | 31.8 | 11 | 50.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
| Above Rs. 100000 | 10 | 37.0 | 7 | 25.9 | 10 | 37.0 | 27 | 100.0 |
| Teaching Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 5 yrs | 18 | 42.9 | 11 | 26.2 | 13 | 31.0 | 42 | 100.0 |
| 6-10 yrs | 36 | 40.9 | 28 | 31.8 | 24 | 27.3 | 88 | 100.0 |
| 11-15 yrs | 34 | 32.4 | 29 | 27.6 | 42 | 40.0 | 105 | 100.0 |
| 16-20 yrs | 22 | 34.4 | 14 | 21.9 | 28 | 43.8 | 64 | 100.0 |
| 21-25 yrs | 16 | 28.6 | 16 | 28.6 | 24 | 42.9 | 56 | 100.0 |
| Above 25 yrs | 16 | 35.6 | 13 | 28.9 | 16 | 35.6 | 45 | 100.0 |
| Type of management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aided | 23 | 34.8 | 20 | 30.3 | 23 | 34.8 | 66 | 100.0 |
| Self-finance | 106 | 34.9 | 82 | 27.0 | 116 | 38.2 | 304 | 100.0 |
| Government | 13 | 43.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 8 | 26.7 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Total | 142 | 35.5 | 111 | 27.8 | 147 | 36.8 | 400 | 100.0 |
| (Ns-Not significant, *-Significant at 5\% level, ** - Significant at $1 \%$ level) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Source: Primary data

The table gives the distribution of category II scores among selected job related factors. It is observed that among the respondents from 50 percent of the professors are high performing category, 43.3 percent of the associate professors are low performers and 37.5 percent of the assistant professors were also low performers.

In the case of Pay Scale, the teachers who are earning Rs.40001-60000, Rs.80001100000 and above Rs. 100000 are fall under high performing category. The teachers earning between Rs.20001-40000, Rs.60001-80000 and above Rs. 100000 are fall under low performing category. Equal percent of teachers who are earning up to Rs. 20000 $(30 \%)$ are fall under all the three categories.

Regarding teaching experience, the teachers having experience between 11-15 years; 16-20 years, 21-25 years and above 25 years are fall under high performing category. Most of the teachers who have experience up to 5 years and 5-10 years are fall under low performing category.

It is seen from the above table that, among the respondents from aided colleges, 34.8 percent are low performers and 34.8 percent are high performers. Among self-finance institutions 38.2 percent belong to High performance groups. However, in the case of Government colleges, 43.3 per cent of the teachers fall under low performing category.

In order to find whether the category II scores are significantly associated with job related factors such as, designation, pay scale, teaching experience and type of management the following hypothesis has been framed and tested.

Ho. There is no significant association between Job related factors and performance assessment category II scores.

Table 6.6 (a). Performance Assessment Category II Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Chi-Square Test |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | Table value | df | Sig. |
| Designation | 17.309 | 13.277 | 4 | $* *$ |
| Pay scale | 5.863 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Teaching Experience | 8.102 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Type of Management | 1.895 | 9.488 | 4 | Ns |

Source: Primary Data

The chi-square test has been applied to verify the hypothesis. Since the calculated value is less than the table value it is inferred that there is no significant association between Pay scale, Teaching Experience, Type of management, with Category II score. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. In the case of designation, the calculated value is more than the table value it is inferred that there is a significant association with Category II score at $1 \%$ significant level. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

The result founds that, the teachers who are in the professor designation are found to be high performing category when compare to other groups. In case of experience the teachers who have less experience are found to be low performing category and the teachers have 11-25 years of experience are found to be in high performing category. Regarding the type of management the teachers working in aided and self finance colleges are found to be in both low and high performing category. But the teachers working in government colleges are more in low performing category when compare to other colleges.

## Distribution for Category III Scores Vs Selected Job Related Factors

Chi square test for Job related factors and performance assessment category III wise distribution is presented in the following table.

Table 6.7. Distribution for Category III Scores Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Category III Score |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low } \\ (<=147) \end{gathered}$ |  | Moderate (148-211) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { High } \\ (>=\mathbf{2 1 2}) \end{gathered}$ |  | No. | \% |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |
| Designation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor | 35 | 27.3 | 43 | 33.6 | 50 | 39.1 | 128 | 100.0 |
| Associate Professor | 48 | 46.2 | 25 | 24.0 | 31 | 29.8 | 104 | 100.0 |
| Assistant Professor | 68 | 40.5 | 56 | 33.3 | 44 | 26.2 | 168 | 100.0 |
| Pay scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to Rs. 20000 | 11 | 36.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 10 | 33.3 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Rs.20001-40000 | 66 | 41.5 | 45 | 28.3 | 48 | 30.2 | 159 | 100.0 |
| Rs.40001-60000 | 48 | 36.9 | 40 | 30.8 | 42 | 32.3 | 130 | 100.0 |
| Rs.60001-80000 | 12 | 37.5 | 13 | 40.6 | 7 | 21.9 | 32 | 100.0 |
| Rs.80001-100000 | 4 | 18.2 | 8 | 36.4 | 10 | 45.5 | 22 | 100.0 |
| Above Rs. 100000 | 10 | 37.0 | 9 | 33.3 | 8 | 29.6 | 27 | 100.0 |


|  | Category III Score |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & (<=147) \end{aligned}$ |  | Moderate$(148-211)$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { High } \\ (>=\mathbf{2 1 2}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | No. | \% |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |
| Teaching Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 5 yrs | 20 | 47.6 | 10 | 23.8 | 12 | 28.6 | 42 | 100.0 |
| 6-10 yrs | 39 | 44.3 | 29 | 33.0 | 20 | 22.7 | 88 | 100.0 |
| $11-15 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 36 | 34.3 | 33 | 31.4 | 36 | 34.3 | 105 | 100.0 |
| 16-20 yrs | 23 | 35.9 | 16 | 25.0 | 25 | 39.1 | 64 | 100.0 |
| 21-25 yrs | 17 | 30.4 | 21 | 37.5 | 18 | 32.1 | 56 | 100.0 |
| Above 25 yrs | 16 | 35.6 | 15 | 33.3 | 14 | 31.1 | 45 | 100.0 |
| Type of management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aided | 24 | 36.4 | 23 | 34.8 | 19 | 28.8 | 66 | 100.0 |
| Self-finance | 114 | 37.5 | 91 | 29.9 | 99 | 32.6 | 304 | 100.0 |
| Government | 13 | 43.3 | 10 | 33.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Total | 151 | 37.8 | 124 | 31.0 | 125 | 31.3 | 400 | 100.0 |
| (Ns-Not significant, *- Significant at 5\% level, ** - Significant at $1 \%$ level) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Primary data
The table gives the distribution of category III scores among selected job related factors. It is observed that among the respondents from 68 percent of the Assistant professors are found to be high performing category. 48 percent of the associate professors and 35 percent of the assistant professors are fall under low performing category.

In the case of Pay Scale, the teachers who are earning from Rs.80001-100000 are fall under high performing category. The teachers earning up to Rs. 20000 and between Rs.20001-40000, Rs.40001-60000, Rs.60001-80000 and Above Rs. 100000 are falling under low performing category

With respect to teaching experience the teachers having experience between 11-15 years; and 16-20 years are fall under high performing category. As well 21-25 years falls under moderate performers, the teachers who have experience up to 5 years, 6-10 years and above 25 years are fall under low performing category.

It is seen that among the respondents from aided colleges, 36.4 percent are low performers and 34.8 percent are high performers. Among self-finance institutions
37.5 percent and 32.6 percent belong to Low and High performance groups. However, in the case of Government colleges, percentage of low performers are high (43.3\%) and only $23.3 \%$ of the respondents from government institutions are high performers

In order to find whether the category III scores are significantly associated with job related factors such as, designation, pay scale, teaching experience and type of management the following hypothesis has been framed and tested.

Ho. There is no significant association between Job related factors and performance assessment category III scores.

Table 6.7 (a). Performance Assessment Category III Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Chi-Square Test |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | Table value | df | Sig. |
| Designation | 12.092 | 9.488 | 4 | $*$ |
| Pay scale | 6.946 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Teaching Experience | 9.464 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Type of Management | 1.664 | 9.488 | 4 | Ns |

Source: Primary Data
The chi-square test was conducted to verify the hypothesis. Since the calculated value is less than the table value it is inferred that there is no significant association between Pay scale, Teaching Experience, Type of management, with Category II score. Hence the hypothesis is accepted. In the case of Designation, the calculated value is more than the table value it is inferred that there is a significant association with Category II score at $5 \%$ significant level. . Hence, the hypothesis is rejected in this case.

The result reveals that Category III also the teachers in the Professor designation are found to high performing group. Associate and Assistant professor are more in low performing group. Pay scale not an influencing factor for performance of the teachers in category III. Regarding the type of management most of the teachers are found in low performing category. Some extend the self finance college are found more in high performing group when compare to other teachers in category III performance assessment. There is a strong association between designation of the teachers and category III of performance assessment.

## Distribution for Category IV Scores Vs Selected Job Related Factors

Chi square test for Job related factors and performance assessment category IV wise distribution is presented in the following table.

Table 6.8. Distribution for Category IV Scores Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Category IV Score |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low } \\ (<=147) \end{gathered}$ |  | Moderate (148-211) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { High } \\ (>=212) \end{gathered}$ |  | No. | \% |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |
| Designation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professor | 43 | 33.6 | 35 | 27.3 | 50 | 39.1 | 128 | 100.0 |
| Associate Professor | 51 | 49.0 | 22 | 21.2 | 31 | 29.8 | 104 | 100.0 |
| Assistant Professor | 80 | 47.6 | 44 | 26.2 | 44 | 26.2 | 168 | 100.0 |
| Pay scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to Rs. 20000 | 14 | 46.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 10 | 33.3 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Rs.20001-40000 | 74 | 46.5 | 37 | 23.3 | 48 | 30.2 | 159 | 100.0 |
| Rs.40001-60000 | 54 | 41.5 | 34 | 26.2 | 42 | 32.3 | 130 | 100.0 |
| Rs.60001-80000 | 16 | 50.0 | 9 | 28.1 | 7 | 21.9 | 32 | 100.0 |
| Rs.80001-100000 | 5 | 22.7 | 7 | 31.8 | 10 | 45.5 | 22 | 100.0 |
| Above Rs. 100000 | 11 | 40.7 | 8 | 29.6 | 8 | 29.6 | 27 | 100.0 |
| Teaching Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 5 yrs | 22 | 52.4 | 8 | 19.0 | 12 | 28.6 | 42 | 100.0 |
| 6-10 yrs | 45 | 51.1 | 23 | 26.1 | 20 | 22.7 | 88 | 100.0 |
| 11-15 yrs | 41 | 39.0 | 28 | 26.7 | 36 | 34.3 | 105 | 100.0 |
| 16-20 yrs | 25 | 39.1 | 14 | 21.9 | 25 | 39.1 | 64 | 100.0 |
| $21-25 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 22 | 39.3 | 16 | 28.6 | 18 | 32.1 | 56 | 100.0 |
| Above 25 yrs | 19 | 42.2 | 12 | 26.7 | 14 | 31.1 | 45 | 100.0 |
| Type of management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aided | 28 | 42.4 | 19 | 28.8 | 19 | 28.8 | 66 | 100.0 |
| Self-finance | 130 | 42.8 | 75 | 24.7 | 99 | 32.6 | 304 | 100.0 |
| Government | 16 | 53.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 7 | 23.3 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Total | 174 | 43.5 | 101 | 25.3 | 125 | 31.3 | 400 | 100.0 |
| (Ns-Not significant, *-Significant at 5\% level, **- Significant at $1 \%$ level) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Primary data

The table gives the distribution of category IV scores among selected job related factors. It is observed that among the respondents from 33.6 percent of the professors, 49 percent of the associate professors and 47.6 percent of the Assistant professors are found to be low performing category. 29.8 percent of the associate professors and 26.2 percent of the assistant professors are falling under low performing category.

In the case of Pay Scale, the teachers who are earning from Rs.80001-100000 are fall under high performing category. The teachers earning up to Rs. 20000 and between Rs.20001-40000, Rs.40001-60000, Rs.60001-80000 and Above Rs. 100000 are falling under low performing category

With respect to teaching experience the teachers having experience between 11-15 years; and 16-20 those having experience up to 5 years, 21-25 years, 6-10 years and above 25 years are fall under low performing category.

It is seen that among the respondents from aided colleges, 42.4 percent are low performers and 28.8 percent are high performers. Among self-finance institutions 42.8 percent and 32.6 percent belong to Low and High performance groups. However, in the case of Government colleges, percentage of low performers are high (53.3\%) and only $23.3 \%$ of the respondents from government institutions are high performers

In order to find whether the category IV scores are significantly associated with job related factors, such as, designation, pay scale, teaching experience and type of management. The following hypothesis has been framed and tested.

Ho. There is no significant association between selected demographic variables and category IV score.

Table 6.8 (a). Performance Assessment Category IV Vs Selected Job Related Factors

|  | Chi-Square Test |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | Table value | df | Sig. |
| Designation | 9.194 | 9.488 | 4 | Ns |
| Pay scale | 6.853 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Teaching Experience | 7.991 | 18.307 | 10 | Ns |
| Type of Management | 2.032 | 9.488 | 4 | Ns |

Source: Primary Data

The chi-square test was conducted to verify the hypothesis. Since the calculated value is less than the table value it is inferred that there is no significant association between Designation, Pay scale, Teaching Experience and Type of management, with Category II at 5\% significant level. Hence the hypothesis is accepted in this case.

The result reveals that the teachers who are associate professors are found to be more in high performing category pay scale is not an influencing factor. In case of experience the teachers who have experience between 11 to 25 years found to be in high performing category. The teachers who have less experience and who have more than 25 years are found to be in low performing category. With respect to type of management most of the teachers working in all these colleges are found in low performing category. The self fiancé colleges teachers are comparatively good regarding category IV of the performance assessment.

## Overall Performance Assessment Vs Demographic/Job Related Factors

ANOVA has been applied to find the whether there is any significant difference in the mean scores of selected job related factors. The results are presented in the following table.

Ho: There is no significant difference between demographic factors and performance assessment.

Table 6.9. ANOVA for Demographic Variables Vs Selected Job Related Factors with performance assessment

| Personal Factors |  | Performance Assessment |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { F/t } \\ \text { Value } \end{gathered}$ | S/NS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D | No. |  |  |
| Gender | Male | 622.50 | 210.62 | 295 | 1.577 | NS |
|  | Female | 584.48 | 216.60 | 105 |  |  |
| Age | Up to 35 yrs | 575.95 | 210.72 | 43 | 2.429 | Ns |
|  | 36-45 yrs | 601.86 | 205.19 | 153 |  |  |
|  | $46-55 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 606.29 | 206.89 | 137 |  |  |
|  | 56-65 yrs | 673.06 | 234.24 | 67 |  |  |
| Designation | Professor | 662.59 | 212.22 | 128 | 5.456 | ** |
|  | Associate Professor | 581.10 | 217.36 | 104 |  |  |
|  | Assistant Professor | 593.82 | 204.21 | 168 |  |  |


\left.| Personal Factors |  | Performance Assessment |  | F/t | S/NS |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | S.D | No. |  |  |$\right)$

Source: Primary data.
The average performance assessment mean score has been found to be high (622.50) for female respondents. The high mean score has been found for the age group
between $56-65$ years (673.06) and the mean score of professors is found to be higher (662.59). It has been observed that mean score is found to be higher for those receive a Pay Scale of Rs 80001 to Rs. 100000 (694.18) and the mean score is found to be higher for those who have experience between 21-25 years (638.27). The scores are found to high for the teachers under present HOD for 7 to 9 years (633.74) and the teachers working in aided type of management (616.71). In case of members in the department the mean score is found to be higher for 21 to 30 members in the department (693.14), those who handle classes for 10 to 15 hours (625.46) and the teachers whose workload is manageable (619.57).

The result of $t$-test shows that the $t$-value 1.577 is less than the table value and so there is no significant relationship between gender and self-awareness. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The ANOVA results states that there is a significant difference between demographic factors and performance assessment in respect of factors, namely Designation, Members in the department. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of Age, Pay Scale, Teaching Experience, Experience under present HoD, Type of management, Hours of classes handled per week and Work load in college. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The factors, namely, designation, Members in the department has played a vital role in the performance assessment of teachers working in engineering college. Hence, these factors have significantly differed in the performance assessment of teachers working in engineering colleges. The teachers who are professor designation and the department having 21-30 members in the department are found to be different when compare to other teachers. Hence, there is significant difference found with respect to designation and number of members in the department.

