Perception Of Faculties Working In Self Financing Colleges Towards Institutional Policies- An Empirical Study

Mrs. Poornima. G[1*], Dr.K.Jothimani[2]

[1*]Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Angappa College of Arts and Science, Seerapalaym, Coimbatore -641105, Tamilnadu.
[2]Department Head and Research Guide, Department of Business administration, Angappa College of Arts and Science, Seerapalaym, Coimbatore -641105, Tamilnadu Email ID: mukunth01@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The study examines the perceptions of faculty members working in self-financing colleges towards institutional policies. The research aims to explore how these policies influence job satisfaction, teaching performance, and overall morale. By utilizing a structured survey method, data were collected from faculties across various self-financing colleges. The results indicate significant relationships between institutional policies and faculty perceptions, particularly concerning workload, administrative support, and professional development opportunities. The study provides insights for policymakers and administrators to refine institutional policies that enhance faculty engagement and retention.

Keywords: Faculty perception, self-financing colleges, institutional policies, job satisfaction, teaching performance and empirical study.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the higher education landscape has witnessed substantial growth in the number of self-financing colleges. These institutions have emerged as significant players in providing educational opportunities, particularly in developing countries. Unlike government-aided colleges, self-financing colleges often operate with a greater focus on financial sustainability and operational autonomy. However, these characteristics may also present challenges, particularly concerning institutional policies that directly affect the faculty's professional environment and satisfaction.

The perceptions of faculty members toward these institutional policies are critical as they shape not only the academic atmosphere but also the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes. Faculty satisfaction with policies related to workload, compensation, administrative support, professional development, and decision-making significantly impacts their commitment to the institution, job performance, and overall morale. Understanding these perceptions is essential for creating policies that foster a positive work environment, enhance faculty retention, and promote academic excellence.

This study aims to empirically investigate the perceptions of faculty working in self-financing colleges regarding institutional policies. By exploring these perceptions, the study provides insights into the effectiveness of current policies and offers recommendations for policy improvements to enhance faculty engagement and institutional success. This research is timely, as the role of faculty in shaping student success and institutional growth has gained increasing recognition, and their perceptions of institutional policies can significantly influence their willingness to contribute positively to the academic community.

REVIEW OF THE STUDY

The literature emphasizes the critical role of institutional policies in shaping faculty perceptions, particularly in self-financing colleges. According to Kaur and Singh (2020), institutional policies on job security, compensation, and opportunities for professional development are pivotal in determining faculty satisfaction and engagement. They found that transparent and supportive policies positively influence faculty morale, leading to higher retention rates and improved teaching quality. Similarly, Pandey (2019) concluded that institutional support in terms of policy clarity and administrative transparency is directly linked to faculty job satisfaction.

A growing body of research highlights the significant impact of workload policies on faculty performance. A study by Sharma (2018) revealed that faculty members in self-financing colleges often report excessive workloads due to limited administrative support and inadequate staffing. These factors negatively impact their teaching effectiveness and research productivity. The study suggested that institutions need to balance workload distribution by incorporating more equitable and supportive policies to maintain high teaching standards and faculty well-being.

The availability and accessibility of professional development opportunities have also been found to be essential for faculty satisfaction. According to Rao and Kumar (2021), institutions that provide continuous professional development opportunities, such as workshops, conferences, and training, have higher faculty morale and engagement levels. They noted that faculties working in self-financing institutions often lack such opportunities, resulting in lower job satisfaction and increased turnover rates.

Compensation remains a primary concern for faculty in self-financing colleges. Mishra and Gupta (2019) found that inadequate and inconsistent compensation policies lead to dissatisfaction among faculty members, significantly

affecting their commitment to the institution. Their study argued that competitive and transparent salary structures are essential to retain talent and improve faculty performance. The absence of standardized pay scales across self-financing institutions often exacerbates feelings of inequity and dissatisfaction among faculty members.

The extent to which faculty members are involved in decision-making processes also influences their perception of institutional policies. Singh and Verma (2022) argued that faculty participation in institutional governance fosters a sense of belonging and empowerment, leading to greater job satisfaction. Their study suggested that self-financing colleges often lack participatory governance structures, which can lead to feelings of marginalization and disengagement among faculty members.

Job security is another critical factor shaping faculty perceptions in self-financing colleges. According to Narayan (2020), the lack of permanent employment contracts in these institutions leads to insecurity and anxiety among faculty members. This often results in lower retention rates and decreased job satisfaction. The study recommended that institutions establish more stable employment policies, such as offering tenure or long-term contracts, to enhance faculty satisfaction and retention.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
The increasing prevalence of self-financing colleges has introduced unique challenges for faculty members, particularly concerning institutional policies related to workload, compensation, job security, and professional development. Faculty perceptions of these policies are critical, as they directly impact their job satisfaction, teaching effectiveness, and overall engagement with the institution. However, there is limited understanding of how these policies influence faculty experiences in self-financing colleges, leading to potential dissatisfaction, low morale, and high turnover rates. This study aims to explore and address these issues by examining faculty perceptions of institutional policies in self-financing colleges.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
➢ To examine faculty perceptions of institutional policies in self-financing colleges, particularly in areas such as workload, compensation, job security, and administrative support.
➢ To assess the impact of these institutional policies on faculty job satisfaction and teaching performance.
➢ To identify key factors contributing to faculty dissatisfaction or satisfaction with the policies implemented by self-financing colleges.
➢ To provide recommendations for improving institutional policies to enhance faculty engagement, retention, and overall institutional effectiveness.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
➢ The scope of this study is to investigate the perceptions of faculty members working in self-financing colleges regarding institutional policies.
➢ The study focuses on key policy areas such as workload, compensation, job security, administrative support, and professional development opportunities.
➢ Faculty from various self-financing colleges will be surveyed to understand how these policies influence their job satisfaction, teaching performance, and overall engagement with the institution.
➢ By exploring these perceptions, the study aims to provide insights that can help administrators and policymakers improve institutional policies, thereby enhancing faculty well-being and institutional success.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
Type of Research
This research is descriptive in nature, aiming to provide a detailed understanding of the perceptions of faculty members working in self-financing colleges towards institutional policies.

Source of Data Collection
Primary Data: The primary data for this study will be collected through a structured questionnaire distributed to faculty members working in self-financing colleges.
Secondary Data: Secondary data will be sourced from websites, journals, and reports related to institutional policies in higher education and faculty satisfaction.
Sampling Technique
The study will employ simple random sampling to ensure that every faculty member in self-financing colleges has an equal chance of being selected for the study.
Sample Size
A sample size of 150 faculty members from various self-financing colleges will be selected to participate in the study.

Tools Used for the Study
Percentage Analysis: Used to analyze the distribution and frequency of responses.

Descriptive Statistics: Employed to summarize and describe the main features of the data.
One-Way ANOVA: Used to test the significance of differences in perceptions across various groups within the sample.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
➢ The study is limited to self-financing colleges and may not generalize to other types of higher education institutions.
➢ The data collected is based on faculty self-reports, which may introduce bias or inaccuracies in the perceptions reported.
➢ The study only includes a sample size of 150, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to the broader population of self-financing college faculty.
➢ The scope of the study is limited to specific institutional policies, and other factors affecting faculty perceptions, such as personal and contextual variables, may not be fully captured.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
Demographic variable's of the respondents

Demographic variables	Particulars	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	51	34.0
	Female	99	66.0
Age group	20-30 years	25	16.7
	31-40 years	36	24.0
	41-50 years	60	40.0
	51 years and above	29	19.3
Educational Qualification	Bachelor's Degree	6	4.0
	Master's Degree	76	50.7
	PhD	41	27.3
	Others	27	18.0
Years of Teaching Experience	Less than 5 years	53	35.3
	5-10 years	41	27.3
	11-15 years	38	25.3
	More than 15 years	18	12.0
Type of Position	Assistant Professor	25	16.7
	Associate Professor	46	30.7
	Professor	38	25.3
	Lecturer	27	18.0
	Other	14	9.3
Type of Appointment	Permanent	44	29.3
	Contractual	43	28.7
	Part-Time	31	20.7
	Visiting Faculty	32	21.3
Monthly Salary Range	Less than Rs.30,000	42	28.0
	Rs. 30,000 – Rs. 50,000	42	28.0
	Rs. 50,000 – Rs. 70,000	36	24.0
	More than Rs. 70,000	30	20.0
Total	**150**	**100.0**	

The demographic data provides a comprehensive view of the faculty members working in self-financing colleges. Females constitute the majority of the sample at 66%, while males account for 34%. The age distribution shows that 40% of respondents are aged 41-50 years, followed by 31-40 years (24%) and 51 years and above (19.3%). A significant portion of the faculty holds a Master's degree (50.7%), and 27.3% possess a PhD, indicating a highly qualified workforce. Teaching experience varies, with the largest group having less than 5 years of experience (35.3%), and fewer faculty members have over 15 years of experience (12%).

The positions within the institutions are fairly distributed, with Associate Professors representing 30.7% of the sample, followed by Professors at 25.3%, and Assistant Professors at 16.7%. A notable portion of the faculty holds Lecturer roles (18%) or other positions (9.3%). In terms of employment type, the sample is evenly divided between permanent (29.3%) and contractual faculty (28.7%), with a sizable proportion of part-time and visiting faculty (42%). Salary data indicates that the majority earn less than ₹50,000 per month, with 28% earning below ₹30,000 and 28% earning between ₹30,000 and ₹50,000, while 20% earn more than ₹70,000.

Descriptive Statistics for various dimension

		N	Mean	SD
Workload and Responsibilities	The workload assigned to me is fair and manageable	150	2.65	1.238
	The institution provides adequate administrative support to handle my workload effectively.	150	2.71	1.185
	I am able to maintain a good work-life balance with my current workload.	150	3.51	1.041
	Teaching and non-teaching duties are fairly distributed among faculty members.	150	3.45	1.173
Compensation and Benefits	I am satisfied with the compensation package offered by the institution	150	3.97	1.129
	My salary is competitive compared to other self-financing colleges.	150	3.11	1.106
	The institution provides adequate benefits such as health insurance and retirement plans	150	3.23	1.429
	Compensation policies are transparent and clearly communicated to faculty members.	150	2.67	1.102
Job Security	I feel secure in my current job position	150	3.21	1.286
	The institution provides opportunities for contract renewal or permanent appointment.	150	3.39	1.375
	There is clear communication regarding job security and contract conditions	150	2.56	1.277

The descriptive statistics for various dimensions related to faculty perceptions in self-financing colleges reveal several key insights. Regarding workload and responsibilities, the mean scores suggest that faculty members generally find their workload manageable (M=2.65, SD=1.238) and are somewhat satisfied with the administrative support provided (M=2.71, SD=1.185). However, they express moderate satisfaction with their ability to maintain work-life balance (M=3.51, SD=1.041) and the fair distribution of duties (M=3.45, SD=1.173).

In the area of compensation and benefits, the faculty members report a moderate level of satisfaction with the compensation package (M=3.97, SD=1.129) but feel that their salary is only moderately competitive (M=3.11, SD=1.106). The provision of benefits, such as health insurance and retirement plans, is rated moderately (M=3.23, SD=1.429), while the transparency of compensation policies is rated lower (M=2.67, SD=1.102).

Job security is another area of concern, with faculty members feeling moderately secure in their positions (M=3.21, SD=1.286) and somewhat satisfied with opportunities for contract renewal or permanent appointment (M=3.39, SD=1.375). However, communication regarding job security and contract conditions is rated relatively low (M=2.56, SD=1.277), indicating a need for better clarity in this area. Overall, the results suggest areas for improvement in administrative support, compensation transparency, and communication regarding job security.

Descriptive Statistics for various dimension

		N	Mean	SD
Professional Development Opportunities	The institution offers adequate opportunities for professional development, such as workshops and training programs.	150	2.97	1.336
	I am encouraged to pursue research and academic development initiatives	150	2.41	1.529
	Funding for attending conferences and seminars is provided regularly	150	2.98	1.138
	The institution supports faculty in pursuing higher education or certifications	150	2.85	1.282
Administrative Support and Decision-Making	The administration is responsive to the concerns of faculty members	150	2.83	1.064
	I am satisfied with the level of transparency in the institution's decision-making process	150	2.93	1.424
	Faculty members are included in key institutional decision-making processes	150	3.56	1.407
	There is good communication between faculty and the administration.	150	3.13	1.482
Overall Satisfaction	I am satisfied with the institutional policies governing my work environment.	150	3.51	1.492
	The institutional policies positively affect my job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness.	150	2.63	1.288
	I would recommend working at this institution to others in my profession	150	2.74	1.071

Regarding professional development opportunities, the mean scores indicate that faculty members have moderate satisfaction with the availability of opportunities for professional development (M=2.97, SD=1.336) and funding for attending conferences (M=2.98, SD=1.138). However, they feel less encouraged to pursue research and academic

development initiatives (M=2.41, SD=1.529) and express moderate satisfaction with the institution's support for pursuing higher education or certifications (M=2.85, SD=1.282).

In terms of administrative support and decision-making, the responses suggest moderate satisfaction with the administration's responsiveness to faculty concerns (M=2.83, SD=1.064) and transparency in decision-making (M=2.93, SD=1.424). Faculty members report higher inclusion in key decision-making processes (M=3.56, SD=1.407) and moderate communication with the administration (M=3.13, SD=1.482).

For overall satisfaction, faculty members seem to have a relatively positive view of their work environment (M=3.51, SD=1.492). However, they feel that institutional policies have a more moderate impact on their job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness (M=2.63, SD=1.288). Their likelihood of recommending the institution to others in their profession is also moderate (M=2.74, SD=1.071).

Comparison between demographic variables (type of position) and various dimension

Ho1: There is no significant difference between demographic variables (type of position) and various dimension

	Type of Position	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Workload and Responsibilities	Assistant Professor	25	2.86	0.545	7.587	.000
	Associate Professor	46	2.93	0.458		
	Professor	38	3.01	0.627		
	Lecturer	27	3.23	0.787		
	Other	14	3.88	0.865		
	Total	150	3.08	0.680		
Compensation and Benefits	Assistant Professor	25	3.62	0.658	3.274	.013
	Associate Professor	46	3.22	0.757		
	Professor	38	3.01	0.865		
	Lecturer	27	3.05	0.990		
	Other	14	3.68	1.063		
	Total	150	3.25	0.873		
Job Security	Assistant Professor	25	3.13	0.733	2.035	.093
	Associate Professor	46	3.07	0.797		
	Professor	38	2.84	0.837		
	Lecturer	27	2.97	0.909		
	Other	14	3.59	1.249		
	Total	150	3.05	0.880		
Professional Development Opportunities	Assistant Professor	25	2.47	0.719	4.219	.003
	Associate Professor	46	2.65	0.772		
	Professor	38	2.86	0.956		
	Lecturer	27	2.91	0.983		
	Other	14	3.57	0.835		
	Total	150	2.81	0.896		
Administrative Support and Decision-Making	Assistant Professor	25	3.44	0.682	5.189	.001
	Associate Professor	46	3.14	0.960		
	Professor	38	2.73	0.922		
	Lecturer	27	2.93	1.058		
	Other	14	3.86	0.641		
	Total	150	3.11	0.953		
Overall Satisfaction	Assistant Professor	25	3.31	0.757	2.257	.066
	Associate Professor	46	2.90	1.056		
	Professor	38	2.71	1.090		
	Lecturer	27	2.83	1.210		
	Other	14	3.45	0.636		

	Type of Position	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Workload and Responsibilities	Assistant Professor	25	2.86	0.545	7.587	.000
	Associate Professor	46	2.93	0.458		
	Professor	38	3.01	0.627		
	Lecturer	27	3.23	0.787		
	Other	14	3.88	0.865		
	Total	150	3.08	0.680		
Compensation and Benefits	Assistant Professor	25	3.62	0.658	3.274	.013
	Associate Professor	46	3.22	0.757		
	Professor	38	3.01	0.865		
	Lecturer	27	3.05	0.990		
	Other	14	3.68	1.063		
	Total	150	3.25	0.873		
Job Security	Assistant Professor	25	3.13	0.733	2.035	.093
	Associate Professor	46	3.07	0.797		
	Professor	38	2.84	0.837		
	Lecturer	27	2.97	0.909		
	Other	14	3.59	1.249		
	Total	150	3.05	0.880		
Professional Development Opportunities	Assistant Professor	25	2.47	0.719	4.219	.003
	Associate Professor	46	2.65	0.772		
	Professor	38	2.86	0.956		
	Lecturer	27	2.91	0.983		
	Other	14	3.57	0.835		
	Total	150	2.81	0.896		
Administrative Support and Decision-Making	Assistant Professor	25	3.44	0.682	5.189	.001
	Associate Professor	46	3.14	0.960		
	Professor	38	2.73	0.922		
	Lecturer	27	2.93	1.058		
	Other	14	3.86	0.641		
	Total	150	3.11	0.953		
Overall Satisfaction	Assistant Professor	25	3.31	0.757	2.257	.066
	Associate Professor	46	2.90	1.056		
	Professor	38	2.71	1.090		
	Lecturer	27	2.83	1.210		
	Other	14	3.45	0.636		
	Total	150	2.96	1.038		

Workload and Responsibilities

The mean scores for workload and responsibilities show that "Other" faculty positions perceive their workload more positively (M=3.88, SD=0.865), followed by Lecturers (M=3.23, SD=0.787). Assistant Professors and Professors have slightly lower perceptions of workload fairness. The ANOVA result (F=7.587, Sig=.000) indicates that these differences are statistically significant, suggesting that perceptions of workload vary considerably by position.

Compensation and Benefits

Faculty members in "Other" positions again report the highest satisfaction with compensation and benefits (M=3.68, SD=1.063), while Professors and Lecturers have lower satisfaction levels. The ANOVA result (F=3.274, Sig=.013) indicates statistically significant differences in how compensation is perceived across different positions. This shows that compensation is viewed more favorably by certain groups within the institution.

Job Security

Job security perceptions are highest among "Other" positions (M=3.59, SD=1.249) and lowest among Professors (M=2.84, SD=0.837). However, the ANOVA result (F=2.035, Sig=.093) indicates that these differences are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This suggests that while perceptions of job security vary by position, these differences are not strong enough to be considered significant across the sample.

Professional Development Opportunities

The "Other" category perceives the most support for professional development (M=3.57, SD=0.835), while Assistant Professors report the lowest support (M=2.47, SD=0.719). The ANOVA result (F=4.219, Sig=.003) indicates statistically significant differences in how professional development opportunities are perceived across different positions, with "Other" positions perceiving more opportunities than other groups.

Administrative Support and Decision-Making

Faculty in "Other" positions report the highest satisfaction with administrative support and decision-making (M=3.86, SD=0.641), while Professors perceive the least satisfaction (M=2.73, SD=0.922). The ANOVA result (F=5.189, Sig=.001) indicates statistically significant differences in perceptions of administrative support and decision-making across different positions.

Overall Satisfaction

Overall satisfaction is highest among those in "Other" positions (M=3.45, SD=0.636) and lowest among Professors (M=2.71, SD=1.090). The ANOVA result (F=2.257, Sig=.066) suggests that while there are variations in overall satisfaction across positions, these differences are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

FINDINGS

➤ A majority of the participants are female (66%),

➤ Significant portion of the respondents falling in the 41-50 years age group (40%), followed by 31-40 years (24%).

➤ In terms of educational qualifications, most faculty members hold a Master's degree (50.7%), while a notable percentage have earned a PhD (27.3%).

➤ The largest group has less than 5 years of teaching experience (35.3%), but a substantial portion has between 5 and 15 years of experience.

➤ The positions held by the respondents are distributed among Assistant Professors (16.7%), Associate Professors (30.7%), and Professors (25.3%).

➤ In terms of employment type, the faculty is almost evenly split between permanent (29.3%) and contractual positions (28.7%), with part-time and visiting faculty making up a combined 42%.

➤ The monthly salary range shows that most faculty earn less than ₹50,000, with 28% earning less than ₹30,000 and 28% earning between ₹30,000 and ₹50,000.

➤ Workload and Responsibilities: The findings indicate significant differences in faculty perceptions of workload and responsibilities across positions (F=7.587, Sig=.000). Faculty members in "Other" positions report the highest satisfaction with workload management (M=3.88), while Assistant Professors report the lowest satisfaction (M=2.86). This suggests that workload distribution may be more favorable for certain positions, potentially impacting job satisfaction.

➤ Compensation and Benefits: There is a statistically significant difference in how different faculty positions perceive their compensation and benefits (F=3.274, Sig=.013). Faculty in "Other" positions report the highest satisfaction with compensation (M=3.68), while Professors report lower satisfaction (M=3.01). This suggests that compensation structures may vary significantly across positions, influencing faculty satisfaction.

➤ Job Security: Although the differences in perceptions of job security across positions are not statistically significant (F=2.035, Sig=.093), faculty in "Other" positions report the highest sense of job security (M=3.59), while Professors report the lowest (M=2.84). While not significant, these variations suggest that faculty in more specialized roles may feel more secure in their positions compared to others.

➤ Professional Development Opportunities: There are statistically significant differences in faculty perceptions of professional development opportunities (F=4.219, Sig=.003). Faculty in "Other" positions report the highest satisfaction with these opportunities (M=3.57), while Assistant Professors report the lowest satisfaction (M=2.47). This indicates that professional development support may be uneven across different faculty positions.

➤ Administrative Support and Decision-Making: Faculty perceptions of administrative support and involvement in decision-making show significant differences across positions (F=5.189, Sig=.001). Again, faculty in "Other" positions report the highest satisfaction (M=3.86), while Professors report the least satisfaction (M=2.73). This suggests that administrative responsiveness and inclusion in decision-making processes may be perceived more positively by faculty in certain roles.

➤ Overall Satisfaction: While the differences in overall satisfaction across positions are not statistically significant (F=2.257, Sig=.066), faculty in "Other" positions report the highest overall satisfaction (M=3.45), while Professors report the lowest (M=2.71). Although not statistically significant, this trend suggests that faculty in less traditional academic roles may experience higher levels of satisfaction compared to those in more conventional academic positions.

SUGGESTIONS:

➢ Institutions should consider revisiting the workload distribution, especially for Assistant Professors who report the lowest satisfaction in this area. Offering better administrative support, fair workload allocation, and a balanced distribution of teaching and non-teaching duties could improve job satisfaction across faculty positions.

➢ Given the significant differences in compensation satisfaction, institutions should standardize salary structures to ensure equity across all positions. Competitive and transparent compensation packages, along with additional benefits such as health insurance and retirement plans, would likely enhance faculty retention and satisfaction, particularly for Professors and Lecturers who report lower satisfaction.

➢ Although job security perceptions are not statistically significant, there is a need to improve transparency and communication regarding job contracts and renewals. Institutions should consider offering clearer pathways to permanent appointments and create policies that bolster job security, especially for Professors and Lecturers who feel less secure.

➢ Institutions should ensure that all faculty members, especially Assistant Professors, have equal access to professional development opportunities such as workshops, conferences, and higher education programs. Establishing funding for faculty development across all positions will support growth and enhance academic performance.

➢ There is a significant disparity in how faculty members perceive administrative support and their involvement in decision-making. To bridge this gap, institutions should foster open communication channels and actively involve faculty in key decision-making processes. Transparent governance and administrative responsiveness will help build trust and engagement, particularly for Professors and Lecturers who report lower satisfaction in this area.

➢ To improve overall satisfaction, institutions should focus on a holistic approach that includes addressing workload concerns, enhancing professional development opportunities, ensuring equitable compensation, and fostering a supportive work environment. Special attention should be given to positions like Professors and Lecturers who report lower overall satisfaction, while leveraging the insights from "Other" positions who report higher satisfaction.

➢ Considering that "Other" positions consistently report higher satisfaction, institutions may benefit from analyzing the support mechanisms available to these roles and replicating successful practices for other faculty positions. By identifying the factors that contribute to their higher satisfaction, institutions can create more tailored strategies that improve the experience of all faculty members.

CONCLUSION:

The study provides valuable insights into the perceptions of faculty members in self-financing colleges regarding various institutional dimensions such as workload, compensation, job security, professional development opportunities, administrative support, and overall satisfaction. A majority of the respondents are female, with significant representation in the 41-50 age group, and most hold a Master's degree. The faculty is evenly split between permanent and contractual positions, with a substantial portion earning less than ₹50,000 per month.

The findings reveal significant differences in perceptions across faculty positions, with faculty in "Other" positions consistently reporting higher satisfaction across all dimensions, including workload, compensation, professional development opportunities, and administrative support. In contrast, Assistant Professors and Professors tend to report lower satisfaction, particularly in terms of workload, compensation, and administrative support.

Although differences in job security and overall satisfaction were not statistically significant, trends suggest that faculty in less traditional roles feel more secure and satisfied compared to those in conventional academic roles. This study highlights the need for institutions to address disparities in workload distribution, compensation equity, and access to professional development opportunities to enhance faculty satisfaction and performance across all positions.

Improving transparency, administrative responsiveness, and involvement in decision-making could further contribute to a more positive and supportive environment for faculty members, ultimately benefiting both the faculty and the institution.

REFERENCES

1. Kaur, P., & Singh, R. (2020). The impact of institutional policies on faculty satisfaction in self-financing colleges. Journal of Higher Education Studies, 12(3), 45-58.
2. Mishra, D., & Gupta, N. (2019). Compensation policies and faculty satisfaction: A study of self-financing colleges. Indian Journal of Education and Management, 8(1), 23-31.
3. Narayan, R. (2020). Job security and faculty retention in self-financing institutions. International Journal of Educational Policy Studies, 7(2), 67-74.
4. Pandey, S. (2019). The relationship between institutional policies and faculty perceptions: Evidence from self-financing colleges. Asian Journal of Education and Development, 11(4), 102-116.
5. Rao, M., & Kumar, S. (2021). Professional development opportunities and faculty engagement: A case study of self-financing institutions. Journal of Faculty Development, 15(2), 78-89.
6. Sharma, A. (2018). Workload distribution and its impact on faculty performance in self-financing colleges. Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 6(1), 34-50.
7. Singh, A., & Verma, K. (2022). Faculty participation in decision-making and its impact on institutional governance in self-financing colleges. Journal of Educational Administration, 14(1), 89-103.