

PERSONALITY VARIABLE AS A MODERATOR FOR EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS RELATIONSHIP: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS FROM HIGHER INSTITUTIONS

Dr Shalini Srivastava

Professor (OB & HR),Jaipuria Institute of Management,Noida

Dr Richa Misra

Associate Professor (IT & Operations),Jaipuria Institute of Management, NOIDA

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to understand the significance of Locus of Control, Employee Engagement and Effectiveness among faculty members in Higher Institutions. We surveyed 151 faculty members in Delhi & NCR region in order to examine the relationship between Effectiveness, Locus of Control, and Employee Engagement as well as the potential moderating effect of Locus of Control in the relationship between Employee engagement and Effectiveness. It was found that both Employee Engagement and Locus of Control were significantly related to Effectiveness. Additionally, Locus of Control significantly and positively moderated the relationship between Employee Engagement and Effectiveness. This study was composed of a single survey of a relatively small number of Faculty members in one region of India. This study contributes to research on Locus of Control, and an increased understanding of Employee Engagement in emerging markets.

Keywords: Higher Institutions, Employee Engagement, Locus of Control, Effectiveness, Faculty, Research Paper

1 Introduction

Mike Johnson in his book “The New Rules of Engagement” very aptly mentioned that *‘the ability to engage employee, to make them work with our business, is going to be one of the greatest organizational battles of the coming 10 years’*. The professional world is appreciating the importance of employee engagement, where engaged employees are the “backbone of good working environments where people are industrious, ethical and accountable” (Levinson, 2007a; Cleland et al, 2008). Mats Lederhausen, former senior executive of McDonald’s Corporation aptly pointed out that “In a prosperous society, you really have only two assets: people—their creativity and skills—and the ecosystem around them. Both need to be carefully tended.”

With the momentous change in the global economy that has immensely impacted the nation, there is a dire need for organizations to uncover novel ways to deal with new hi-technical, demographic and marketplace realities. Most of the organizations today are operating in a very profit margin and to survive and win in today's highly competitive market place, the most critical role is played by the motivated and committed work-force of the organization. The mantra of today's business is to do more with less and here engaged employees may be the difference between surviving and flourishing. The bottom line is that today in an unstable economic environment employee engagement matters more than ever. Research shows that engagement results in elevated employee's performance and organizational accomplishment. There is a clear indication that the employee engagement gap between average and high performing organizations is increasing (Employee Engagement 2012 Benchmark Study).

In higher education, the most important stakeholder is the students and the success of students largely depends on their faculty. In India, number of universities and institutes offering higher education are increasing day by day but the higher education in India is faced with a host of challenges and problems. The biggest challenge before the HEIs is the employability of their students. Needless to say that majority of students join an educational institution to build up their careers. But the HEIs aren't so successful to develop the competencies required by the industry. Literature emphasizes that faculty play an important role in their students' success. Faculty contributes to student success through social as well as academic supports such as comprehensive student orientation programs, learner-centered courses, advising, and mentorship. It was found the HEI's where the faculty was frequently interacting with student's results in significant learning experience and practical skills.

An engaged faculty will exhibit an elevated scale of commitment and involvement in the job. For them teaching is more of passion than fulfillment. The most critical question here is from where the passion and engagement of a faculty reflect upon? *The present study tries to go deeper into the analysis of what engages the faculty of management colleges and university and how internal locus of control increases their effectiveness.*

2 Review of Literature

Engagement in true sense is “winning the hearts and minds of employees”. Employee engagement is a vital element of organizational achievement. Employee engagement is cultivated through passion, connection and enthusiasm definition given by Hardrick and Fernandez(2012). Employee engagement is preminent defined as the scale of commitment to a particular job. (Barman and Saikat,2011).The International Survey Research (ISR) defines employee engagement as, “a process by which an organization enhances commitment and retention of its employees to the accomplishment of better results.”

According to the Gallup the Consulting organization there are different types of people: - Engaged— Engaged employees are the builders of the organization. They are there in the profession because they are passionate about what they are doing. They reflect energy and positivity. They are the one who brings innovation and new ideas to the organization. The second

category is: Not engaged- this is most common category in the organization. They lack leadership and innovation. They simply execute the job without adding any value to it. They are not open to multitasking. They depend on superiors for the decisions. The third category is: Actively disengaged: They are the negative and unhappy people and spread negativity in the organization. With their perceived thoughts and opinion they provoke other competitive people to leave the organization and they believe that this is the way to reach to the top management. They're constantly against almost everything.

For a higher education institute the most important pillar is the faculty (Rhoades,2012).They are essential to quality and completion. In recent days a great deal of the focus is on student centricity and has swung the center from faculty. The management is concentrating on promoting student centered strategies. Most of the modernization and technology is intended at increasing student engagement and they are not realizing the role of leadership while taking the initiatives. The success of student centric approach largely depends on the leadership and involvement of professors and there by faculty is the focus on the strategies that led to improve the quality of students.Faculty must recognize their value as a significant factor in the continued success of the university. As per Newcombe,(2012), the most significant employee engagement strategies being used within higher education were: clarity of role, setting performance expectations and regular appraisals. The above mentioned research revealed majority of respondents (82%) agree that motivation and engagement had increased over the past five years, but the (47%) respondents said that the university lacks a talent management strategy in place.

The beginning of employee engagibility starts with our genetic and biological heredity which drives significant behavioral dispositions. Schaufeli and his co-researchers (2002) defined engagement .The employee who reflected vigor,dedication and absorption exhibited an affirmative and satisficing job related perception. Vigor is defined as willingness to continuously contribute in one's job showing enthusiasm and standing strong when the situation are not so favorable. Dedication is defined as an unconditional onus towards own job amalgamated with the charactersic of enthausiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge. The variable absorption is reflected by an employee's hundred percent commitment and engagement in the job role. The engagement is in such a way when the employee is so much engrossed in his job that the time limit is not a constraint. Many empirical postulate have validate the three factor conceptual framework and constracted tools to meauré engagement in jobs.

In order to be effective, it's crucial for any organization to understand the charterstics which defines effectiveness of a manager.This is an area that is rigorously discussed by academicians for time. Numerous academicians have underlined the progress of individual competency to be an successful executive which has been well incorporated by Gupta(1996) who designed a measure of Managerial Effectiveness integrating 16 factors for measuring effectiveness. The traditional view emphasizes the ability to set and achieve goals and achieving goals implies achieving the results. A manger that is able to place the goal so that it is able to attain the desired outcome is surely going to be regarded as an effective manager. Whereas the Individual competency or personal attributes of an individual have been included in the activities of the manager's position and developing further potential aspects of Gupta's Scale. The Individual

competency speaks about the individual's attributes which leads to increasing the potential of an Individual. Here potentiality describes the skill and competence of an individual in terms of dealing with day to day concerns in a successful approach. Thereby if a manager is able to resolve the prevailing issues in his domain, he will be able to achieve the positive results.

The effectiveness of a manager is characterized with three perspectives: self, place where the manager works and long-established customary. The customary representation highlights the capability to place and attain purpose (Bartol and Martin, 1991) where it is absolutely understood that efficacy of a manager is directly proportional to the success of company. The organizational proficiency means the existence of extended phrase potential approach that leads to control both external and internal influence on the organizations. The organization competency approach follows the method where a future image is created for the organization, accordingly goals are established that will lead to accomplishment of vision and plans build up to attain the strategic goals. Thereby the organisations strive to form the entire ecosystem by taking into account the expertise and attributes of managers to facilitate them to attain considered target. On the other hand individual competency model of managerial effectiveness concentrate on individual as compared to the organization.

To be effective manager adaptability is the key thing; both internal and external environment is dynamic. The circumstances and requirements keeps on changing and an effective manager is able to adapt successful to the changing as environment as per the scholarly work done by Hersay and Blanchard (1977). The success of a manger is decided by his decisions, a manager who is able to deal successfully in the most adverse situation is the one who climbs the corporate tree. Katz and Kahn,(1978) in their research work came to the conclusion that it is the managerial responses to the organizational change. The response was categorized into seven attributes (locus of control, generalized self-efficacy, self-esteem, positive affectivity, openness to experience, tolerance for ambiguity, and risk aversion). Finally they have condensed seven attributes into two dimensions: affirmative belief in employee's own personality and ability to undertake and manage risk. The above mentioned factors extensively determines the individual ability to handle change and adverse situations.

A good number of researches on Managerial effectiveness or competence threw light on individual characteristics. This minimizes the influence of circumstance, which can support or hamper job performance. Mott (1971) recognized three dimensions explicitly productivity, flexibility and adaptability. As per the Jain study (1999) where the categorization of dimension was based on factor analysis three factors was defined explicitly they are functional effectiveness, interpersonal effectiveness and personal effectiveness. The difference cited in the literature may be accounted as a result of cross cultural difference. The studies that are able to establish the associations between cultural values and behaviors' are related are scarce that comprehensively covers the global difference in modern society.

One of the commonly used construct in psychology which is functional to deal with individuals is Locus of Control (Antonovsky, 1991: Rotter, 1966). As a feature of behavior, Locus of Control defines an individual expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement

(Rotter, 1966). Particularly, it refers “to the degree to which people consider the effect of exterior aspects such as chance and powerful others are in charge of the events that impacts their lives” (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004).

The difference of behaviour at the organization is largely accounted to individual variables Spector, P. E., (1982) and it further helps in accepting Locus of control as one of the most significant determinant variables that have been researched in diverse work and organizational settings. Spector (1982) have given their views of personality dimension in conjunction to the work context. Findings reveals that internal factors be likely to be more contented with their jobs as compared to external ones, they perceive their superior as more thoughtful and commence structure report reduced role stress, recognize more independence and control, and be liable to support extended job term. As far as internal subjects are concerned, accomplishment in the work background is observed to be in their hands and is an outcome effort puts in. As per the work done by Kasperson (1982) where the sample belongs to hospital employees, had discovered a strong, positive and significant correlation between negative attitudes and external locus of control. The outcome is reduced satisfaction in the current assignment. The employees who exhibited positive attitudes are usually found to be more contented with outcomes as a result of the degree of control they have to make things work. Knoop (1981) revealed an association among employees with an internal locus of control and how they perceive their jobs in regard to skill variety, task uniqueness and consequence, self-sufficiency, and feedback from the job. Employees with an internal locus of control believed that they were provided a number of prospects to be engage in constructive work.

By and large, they believe more engagement and the authority to make decisions makes difference. An individual's locus of control surely has an extensive influence on work and life. The employee who scored high on internal locus of control would perceive challenge as a prospect for knowing and helpful in attaining career growth. On the other hand employee who scored, high on external locus of control would overlook these challenges on account of their belief that learning from dealing with complicated situation will have no influence on their personal and professional well being. Another research by Judge et al. (1998) established that locus of control is strongly correlated with self-efficacy. According to them self-efficacy is an individual judgment of their own skill and ability to activate the motivation, cognitive resources and, desirable to apply general control over events in an individual's life.

Locus of control refers to a person's view on the level of control and influence they have on the rewards and promotions they receive/achieve (Ivancevich, Konopaske, and Matteson, 2011). Locus of control can be either external or internal depending upon their perception towards their reward received as the result of their own act or some external force was responsible for the same. The manager who believe what they are getting is not a result of hard work but is is destined were categorized as externals on the other hand who stongly believe their success is a result of contionous dedication ,hard work and sincere commitment are charactrsed as internals. (Selart, 2005). Many researches in the literature also supported the managers with internal locus of control were more successful and had an attribute of leadership skill in them. The conjecture is further detailed by the findings i.e managers with internals took the full onus on their job

responsibility and readily accepts failures and faults on own (Klein and Wasserstein-Warnet, 2000).

Studies taken by Aube et al 2007, Chen and Silverthorne 2008, found Locus of control as a strong moderator which significantly influence employee outcomes such as commitment, satisfaction, turnover intentions and effectiveness. The studies have further shown that generally an internal LOC is associated with more desirable employee outcomes of lower turnover, greater job satisfaction and effectiveness than external Locus Of Control. As per the literature the university lecturer high on internal locus of control exhibited higher degree of sincerity, optimism and willingness in contrast to the lectures having external locus of control. As per Cheng (1990) internal believes they are there in the organisation because they are passionate towards it, they like their job and if they have difference they will prefer leaving the job but as long as they are there in the institute their dedication will remain hundred percent.

3 Academic Perspectives of Employee engagement

The academic research has been concentrating on individual attributes like skills, attributes and capability of the manager at individual level, and the organization and nation at higher level. There is a dearth of academic studies on the antecedents of employee engagement. Only few research has been done by Kahn (1990) attributed meaningfulness, safety and availability as the three psychological conditions which influences employees to engage themselves in their work. Nelson & Cooper (2007), perceived engagement as a positive psychology as it is related with increased caring about personal outcomes and contributes to the meaning of individuals assign to their work." The scholarly work done by Harter et al., (2002) has been very significant in recognizing the effect of engagement. As a notion the term has evolved over time, engagement has been described a number of times in the literature and most of the times there were conflicting findings, as a result the term has become unclear to many and it is exceptional to find reviews describing the term in similar mode (Macey and Schneider, 2008a). the cellular service provider Vodaphone terms employee engagement as 'a result "considered or observed as a cause of people being dedicated to something (benefit: tangible or intangible) or else someone (leadership) in the business – an excellent attempt that is happily performed".'(Suff, 2008) Johnson and Johnson have characterized engagement of the employee as 'the scale where employees feels contented for the work responsibility assigned to them, experience appreciation, develop association, conviction to their job role. The employee characterized as engaged reflected high level of commitment to the organization and constantly come across innovative and efficient ways to append significance to the organisation. The output is an organization with superior performance where employees are growing and efficiency is enlarged and prolongs. (Catteeuw et al., 2007)

3.1 Faculty and Engagement

Scholarly work done on higher education has opined various visions in literature. Engagement in faculty members is diverse. The expression engagement in accordance to faculty members usually implies to job profiles that has widened outside the boundary of institution (Antonio et

al., 2000; Ward, 2003). In addition to, Boyer's (1990) representation based on scholarship, predominantly talks about the relevance of application which proposes that the faculty member apply understanding from the knowledge through research to aid others in the community, This has been applied interchangeably with faculty engagement (O'Meara et al., 2009).

In reviewing the definitions of engagement found in the psychology and business literature, seven components were identified: energy, attention, enjoyment, purpose, values, efficacy, and resilience.

Numerous researchers have attempted to void the gap in literature by discovering faculty members' scholar, emotional, and spiritual characteristic (Palmer, 1998) in addition to their personal engagement in their job (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005). As per the faculty engagement model by (Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi) suggested that faculty engagement is an outcome of internal motivation; "it is when an individual likes and deeply concerned regarding the job they do, and they are excited about the people they work with, they are most liable to desire to brilliance and ethical conduct"

The attributes of *highly engaged faculty member* were: they are completely committed to their job assignment, They take pleasure in their assignment and find an aha feeling through it, they understand that their assignment is significant and sets his or her standards, feel enthusiastic to develop in knowledge and proficiency, and stay efficient in spite of contending demands.

As per the Baldwin's (1990) definition based on composite scoring a highly engaged faculty member is an individual who scores a high composite score in teaching commitment, research, service engagement, and fit.

As per MSU definition engagement is a type of scholarship that includes teaching, research, and service. It encompasses creating, disseminating, applying, and conserving knowledge for the undeviating advantage of audiences. These actions are in line with the university and the individual objectives. (<http://www.msu.edu/unit/outreach/missiondefinition.html>)

Faculty recognizes engagement as essential as their professional commitments. As per Tom Newcombe, the most significant employee engagement strategies being used within higher education were: clarity of role, setting performance expectations and regular appraisals. The research revealed majority of respondents (82%) agree that motivation and engagement had increased over the past five years, but the (47%) respondents said that the university lacks a talent management strategy in place.

4 Statement of the Problem

The Higher Educational Institutions are facing a lot of uproar in terms of effectiveness due to lack of faculty engagement. This lack of engagement can also be due to lack of strong Internal Locus of Control. Thus, less effectiveness may be due to a lack of locus of control and employee engagement.

4.1 Rationale

- Understand and explore the role of Internal locus of control on Effectiveness of Faculty members.
- To identify the impact of Employee Engagement on Effectiveness of Faculty members.
- To understand how Internal Locus of Control moderates the effect of Employee Engagement on Effectiveness of Faculty members.

4.2 Hypotheses Development

After reviewing the literature, following hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

- H1: There will be a direct association among Internal Locus of Control and Employee Engagement
- H2: There will be a direct association among Internal Locus of Control and Effectiveness.
- H3: Employee Engagement is directly related to Effectiveness.
- H4: Presence of Internal Locus of control as an interaction will strengthen the relationship between Employee Engagement and Effectiveness.

4.3 Method

Sample Collection

151 Faculty members were chosen on the basis of convenient sampling method from various management institutions located in the Delhi, NCR region. Forty six of the sample was male and the rest were females. 55% of the sample were married. 64% of the respondents were between the ages of 35 to 55, 5% were between 56-60 and the rest of the sampling unit belong to 26 and 34 years old category. Most of the respondents (70%) had between eight and above years of work experience and the rest had less than 8 years of job tenure.

4.4 Tools Used

SPSS 18 was used to analyze the present work. Data was summarized by using mean test and standard deviation to explain the characteristics and behavior of the sample collected from selected categories. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to measure and assess the validity and reliability of measurement scales (Hair et al., 2006). To test the hypothesized model, for Internal Locus of Control as an interaction, a hierarchical regression analysis was used. (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

4.5 Scaling Instruments

Employee Engagement : Schaufeli & Bakker's Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) –was used in present study. The scale is a 15-item version that comprises of the three constituting aspects of work engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption. A 7 point scale is used in measuring answers varying from 'Never' (0) to 'Always' (6). Scale items include "At my work, I feel bursting with energy" (Vigor), "My job inspires me" (Dedication) and "When I am working, I forget everything else around me" (Absorption).

AJMR Journal of Management & Research, December 2018, Volume 12 Issue 4/4, ISSN 0974 – 497

Locus of Control Inventory (LOCO). The instrument was designed by Udai Pareek (1992). The LOCO inventory has 10 items each for Internality (I), Externality (Others), and Externality (Luck). A 5 point scale is used in measuring answers varying between ‘hardly feel’(0) to ‘strongly feel’(4) In all three factors, only internal locus of control was found to be significant. ($\alpha=0.86$).

Managerial Effectiveness. It was assessed by using the 45 item scale designed by Gupta (1996). The instrument explain the characteristic of leader by encompassing sixteen factors of effectiveness. Respondants are required to specify their frequency to engage in a range of behaviors using a five point Likert scale varying from never (1) to always (5). The instrument items include: “I successfully resolve interpersonal conflicts between subordinates” and “My subordinates trust me and depend upon me for support.” The scale alpha is .83.

Control variables. As per the review of articles (e.g., Cooper et al., 1991; Rashed, 2001; Roberts et al., 1997; Smith et al., 1998) the present study also controlled for background variables. The dummy variables included Gender (coded 0 -male, 1 -female), Age (coded 0 -20-30 years, 1-31-40 years, 2- 41-50 years), Marital Status(coded 0 -married, 1 -unmarried), and Job tenure and work experience (coded 0 -1-5 years, 1 - 6-10 years, 2 -11-15 years, 3- 16 years and above).

4.6 Results

The present study conducted single cross sectional design, we followed the usual practice (e.g., Prati et al., 2009) and perform the Harman’s one-factor test. The result specified that no one factor accounted for most of the variance, suggesting that common method bias was not a problem.

Table 1: Factor Analysis of Harman’s Single Factor Test

Sl.No.	Component	Eigenvalue	%age of Variance	%age Cumulative
1	Effectiveness	5.46	33.24	33.24
2	Internal Locus of control	2.84	28.70	61.94
3	Employee Engagement	2.98	19.43	81.37

As the above table shows, the factor analysis revealed 3 separate factors with eigenvalue above 1. It also shows that the first factor did not explain the majority of the variance, with the 2 remaining factors explaining more varied than the first factor. The items on each scale loaded predominantly on a single factor, demonstrating that each scale was independent of the others. This suggests that common method variance was not a significant problem for the current study.

Table 2: Results of Validity and Reliability Analyses for Measurement Scales

Variable	Item	Factor Loading	KMO	Bartlett' Test of Sphericity	Eigen Value	Variance explained	Cronbach α	
1	Effectiveness	45	.64	.68	212.12 **	5.46	51.32	.83
2	ILOC	10	.70	.72	273.12**	2.84	52.48	.86
3	EE	16	.61	.68	206.34**	2.98	52.23	.79

Note:** significant at .05 levels

ILOC-Internal Locus of Control

EE-Employee Engagement

Source: Authors' Empirical Survey

Table 2 shows the results of validity and reliability analyses for measurement scales.

It depicted (1) the value of factor analysis for all items that correspond to each research variable was 0.5 and more, depicting the items met the defined standard of validity analysis, (2) all research variables depicted above meet the defined standard of KaiserMeyerOlkin's value of 0.6, were significant in Bartlett's test of sphericity, (3) all variables under study had eigen values more than 1, (4) the items for each variable under study crossed the factor loadings of 0.50 (Hair et al., 2006), and (5) all variables under study crossed the defined standard of reliability analysis of 0.70 (Nunally & Bernstein, 1994).

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Analysis and Descriptive Statistics (N= 151)

Sl. No.	Scale	Mean	SD	1	2
1	Effectiveness	42.16	4.36		
2	Internal Locus of control	7.56	3.24	.54**	
3	Employee Engagement	20.24	2.14	.58**	.62**

N=151 **P<.01

Source: Authors' Empirical Survey

The above table shows that Internal locus of control is positively and significantly related to effectiveness ($\pi=.54, <.01$), thus, proving the first hypothesis of the study.

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Results

Independent Variables	Std Beta Step 1	Std Beta Step 2	Std Beta Step 3	Std Beta Step 4
Control Variables				
Gender	0.06			
Age	0.14			
Marital Status	0.01			
Work Experience	0.16			

Job Tenure	0.24			
Model Variable Employee Engagement		0.58**		
Moderating Variable Internal Locus of Control			0.62**	
Interaction Term Employee engagement * Internal Locus of Control				.42**
R²	0.124	0.363	0.548	0.786
Adj R²	0.120	0.352	0.543	0.772
R² Change	0.124	0.239	0.185	0.238
F Change	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05

Source: Authors' Empirical Survey

Table 4 illustrates the output for the regression analysis. In the earliest step, we entered the demographic variables. The result depicts that there is no significant relationship between demographic variables and effectiveness. The dummy variables reflected no sign of significance. When the employee engagement dimension was entered into the regression model, we observed it was directly and significantly associated to effectiveness ($\beta = .58$, $p < .01$) thus, proving the third hypothesis of our study. The second hypothesis that Internal locus of control is positively related to Effectiveness is proved by the result which portrays that Internal locus of control showed a significant and direct association with effectiveness ($\beta = .62$, $p < .01$). In the final step, the interaction effect between Internal locus of control and Employee engagement was entered. The interaction of ILOC and EE was significant, (**R² Change=18.5%** $p < .01$), indicating that ILOC moderated the relationship between Employee engagement and effectiveness, thus, proving the fourth hypothesis as well.

5 Discussion

In higher education the prime responsibility of a faculty is considered to be teaching and research. The findings suggest that faculty engagement do matter and established the relationship between faculty engagement and the effectiveness. In the perceptive of academics the behavior and attitude of faculty has a dramatic effect on student learning and engagement. It was found that a highly engaged faculty reflects enriched educational experiences and exhibited active participation in other service responsibility leading to increased managerial effectiveness.

The energetic and intense focus described by (Maslach and Leiter, 1997) shares similarities with Vigour explained. Vigour which is described as "the state in which people are so concerned in a task that nothing else seems to matter". An highly engaged faculty exhibits enhanced commitment and is able to understand the intricacies of the roles that leads to a successful achievement of the organizational objective.

The present study is conducted to understand the role of locus of control as an interaction/moderator in increasing managerial effectiveness, in an effort to bridge the gap in the literature

AIMA Journal of Management & Research, December 2018, Volume 12 Issue 4/4, ISSN 0974 – 497

by providing empirical evidence on how a faculty with a higher score in internal locus of control is outperforming in attaining the institutional as well as scholarly objective. The association among locus of control (LOC) and academic achievement discovered that more internal beliefs are resulting in greater academic achievement. (Wallston,1978) .Faculty with an internal locus of control believes that their own actions determine the rewards that they obtain. More internal locus of control further enhanced the effectiveness of a faculty, they tend to be more achievement oriented .

A highly engaged and committed faculty will make an idealistic environment that will have a significant influence on student learning and nation building.

6 Implications for Higher Institutions

The present work gives us an insight that Internal Locus of control acts as a moderator between two important variables i.e., Employee Engagement and Effectiveness. Higher Institutions need to realise that keeping the faculty engage in true sense will make the students turn out as ‘Healthy Cows’ not ‘Happy Cows’. Faculty members with internal locus of control helps in making them more satisfied and thus, more committed or loyal to the Insitute.

7 Limitations

The present study has its own shorcimings,Foremost, the samping unit are only restricted to Delhi -NCR region.A comparative study among public and private Institution might give a different perspective.a large sample covering different parts of the country can give a better insight. More personality dimensions can be incorporated for understanding the antecedents of effectiveness.

8 Conclusion

From the basis of the study it is established that Internal Locus of control is a significant personality dimension is positively linked with effectiveness. As expected, faculty members with internal locus of control are likely to be more effective.. The result of this study are veru much relevant for Higher educational Institutions. Engaging the faculty involves understanding their concerns and inhibitions and addressing them in a positive way. This attitude will certainly make the faculty an urge to be a pat of the Institute, therby inculcating a sense pf pride and in return make them more engaged resulting in effectiveness.

9 References

Antonovsky, A. (1991). The structural sources of salutogenic strengths. In C.L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.). Personality and stress. Individual differences in the stress process, 67-104.Chichester: Wiley

Aube C., Rousseau V. and Morin E. M. (2007) "Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment: the moderating effect of locus of control and work autonomy" *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 22 No.5 pp. 479-495

Catteeuw F, Flynn E, VonderhorstJ (2007), 'Employee engagement: boosting productivity in turbulent times', *Organization Development Journal*, 25 (2), 151–157

Chen J., and Silverthorne (2008) "The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan" *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* Vol.29 No.7 pp.572 – 582

Cheng, C.Y. (1990).The Relationship of Job Attitudes and Organizational Commitment to Different Aspects of Organizational environment. The American Educational Research Association, pp. 1-43.

Cleland A, Mitchinson W, Townend A (2008), *Engagement, Assertiveness and Business Performance – A New Perspective*, Ixia Consultancy Ltd

Firth, L., Mellor, D.J., Moore, K.A., Loquet, C. (2004), "How can managers reduce employee intention to quit?", *Journal Managerial Psychology*, 19(1/2), pp70-87.

Gupta, S. (1996), "Managerial Effectiveness: Conceptual framework and Scale Development", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 31, No.3, pp. 392-409.

Harter JK, Schmidt FL, Hayes TL (2002), 'Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279

Hersay,P.&K.Blanchard (1977), *Management of Organisation Behaviour. Utilising Human Resources*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2011). *Organizational behavior and management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Jain, P. (1999), "Development and standardisation of a scale for measuring managerial effectiveness", Prestige Institute of Management and Research.

Judge, T., Locke, E., Durham, C., and Kluger, A. (1998), dispositional effects on job satisfactions and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83, pp 17-34

Kahn WA (1990), 'Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work', *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724

Kasperson, C. (1982), locus of control and job dissatisfaction. *Psychological reports*, 50, pp 823-826

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. 1966, 1978. *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley

Klein, J., & Wasserstein-Warnet, M. (1999). Predictive validity of the locus of control test in selection of school administrators. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38, 7-24.

Knoop, R. (1981), locus of control as a moderator between job characteristics and job attitudes. *Psychological reports*, 48, pp 519-525.

Lam, K.S.S. (2005). School of organizational structures: Effects on professor & students learning. *Journal of Organizational Administration*, Vol.43, pp.387-401.

Levinson E (2007a), Developing High Employee Engagement Makes Good Business Sense, www.interactionassociates.com/ideas/2007/05/developing_high_employee_engagement_makes_good_business_sense.php

MaceyWH, Schneider B (2008a), 'The meaning of employee engagement', *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 1, 3–30

Mott, E.P. (1971), *The Characteristics of Effective Organizations*, Harper and Row, New York, NY,

Nelson, D. & Cooper, C. L. (2007). *Positive Organizational behaviour. Accentuating the positive at work*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Prati, L. M., McMillan-Capehart, A., and Karriker, J. H. (2009), 'Affecting Organizational Identity'. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 15, pp. 404-415.

Rotter, J.B. (1966), "Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement", *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1), pp 128.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28 (1, Whole No. 609).

Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25, 293-315.

Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of burnout and engagement: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.

Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W. & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout and engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57, 173-20

Selart, M. (2005). Understanding the role of locus of control in consultative decision-making: A case study. *Management Decision*, 43, 397-412.

Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control.

Suff R (2008), 'Vodafone's entertaining employee-engagement strategy', *IRS Employment Review*, 896

