Research Paper
Impact Factor: 6.462
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal
www.ijmsrr.com

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

QUALITY KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ON WOMEN FACULTY

Ms. DolanChampa Banerjee
Department Head &Assistant Professor, St. Agnes College (Autonomous), Mangaluru-575002.

Abstract
The purpose of the study is to scrutinise the importance of continuous self- learning which leads to competitive advantage among faculty in educational institutions. Quality is a relative term which plays an imperative role in teaching field. To maintain quality one has to be consistent and persistent throughout, to handle all sorts of stakeholders. Quality comes from experience and qualification. Research demonstrates that experienced teachers know their subject matter differently than their less experienced colleagues (Grant 1988; Hashweh 1987; Leinhardt and Smith 1985). Researchers have now begun to examine college faculty members' pedagogical beliefs, decisions, and judgments during teaching in a systematic way (Fernandez-Balboa and Stiehl 1995). The study is based on primary data for which a close ended questionnaire was prepared for survey through convenience sampling method. Respondents were briefed before the survey.As the study was based on bivariate variable so correlation and cross tabulation analysis was applied. Some significant facts have been observed from this study.

Keywords: Continuous Self- Learning, Experienced Faculty, Competitive Advantage.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management (KM) can be defined as a systematic and integrative process of coordinating the organisation-wide activities to retrieve, use, share, create and store knowledge, actionable information and expertise of individuals and groups in pursuit of organisational goals (Cheng 2012; Rastogi 2000). Each activity in knowledge management is really tough and challenging. Maintenance and practice play key role in dealing with it.

Today teaching and learning scenario is little different. Faculty has to be a constant learner. They learn not only to give lectures but also for their respective self-development. In the past, research in the field of higher education has frequently focused on faculty workload and has Operationalized faculty teaching in terms of number of courses taught, number of student-hours generated, or number of hours spent on teaching. Recent research shows that some instructional interventions may be effective in helping faculty improve teaching (Annis 1989; Eble and McKeachie 1985; Rorschach and Whitney 1986; Weimer and Lenze 1991). Today teaching has gone to a different level. Student's expectation, their way of learning, their participation and involment in class has crossed all boundaries. Hence to meet these challenges faculties have to be a step ahead. Hence experienced faculty do possess a competitive advantage to cope up with the contemporary challenges. Their knowledge is practical, as it has developed over the years through accumulated 'wisdom of practice' (Shulman 1987). Later it was expanded to include workshop presentations, travel, and teaching effectiveness programs (Baiocco and DeWaters 1995).

1.1 Quality Knowledge

Quality is a relative term which plays an imperative role in teaching field. To maintain quality one has to be consistent and persistent throughout, to handle all sorts of stakeholders. Quality comes from experience and qualification. Research demonstrates that experienced teachers know their subject matter differently than their

less experienced colleagues (Grant 1988; Hashweh 1987; Leinhardt and Smith 1985). Experience through learning plays a vital role in teaching which eventually lead to build professional currency. Hence experience and learning are the pillars of effective teaching.In more recent times, professional development for faculty has continued to focus primarily on cultivating greater expertise in a specific discipline (Gaff and Simpson 1994) and has been somewhat limited to activities such as orientation of new faculty, visiting professorships, academic leaves, reduction of course loads (Schuster 1990).

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of the study is to scrutinise the importance of quality knowledge through constant planning, consistent performance and continuous self- learning among faculty in educational institutions.

2.0 Methods

The study is based on primary data for which a close ended questionnaire was prepared for survey through convenience sampling method. Respondents were briefed before the survey. As the study was based on bivariate variable so correlation and cross tabulation analysis was applied. Some significant facts have been observed from this study.

2.1 Hypotheses

H01: There is no significant difference between age of the respondent and I fail to plan my lessons every working day.

H02: There is no significant difference between marital status and I maintain high level of consistent performance.

H03: There is no significant difference between marital status and I do not get time for self- learning.

3.0 Data Analysis And Interpretation

3.1 Demographic Profile

3.1.1 Age of the respondent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Within 30	129	77.2	77.2	77.2
	31-40	29	17.4	17.4	94.6
	41-50	9	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	167	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation:77.2% of the respondents belong to 31- 40 years of age while 17.4% belongs to 31- 40 years and 5.4% belong to 41-50 years of age.

3.1.2Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Age of the respondent	1.28	.558	167
I fail to plan my lessons every working day	4.02	.911	167

Interpretation: In descriptive statistics it is comprehended that 77.2% of the respondent are within the age group of 30 years of age and the overall mean and standard deviation is .558

3.2 CROSS-TABULATION

3.2.1 Age of the respondent * I fail to plan my lessons every working day Cross-tabulation

Count							
		I fail to plan my lessons every working day					
		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Age of the respondent	**Within 30**	3	5	16	67	38	129
	31-40	2	1	2	17	7	29
	41-50	0	0	1	3	5	9
Total		5	6	19	87	50	167

Interpretation: 81.39% within the age group of 30 years disagree with the fact that they fail to plan their lessons every working day, 82.75% fall under 31- 40 years of age follow the same and 88.88% fall under the age group of 41- 50 years of age.

3.2.2 Correlations			
		Age of the respondent	I fail to plan my lessons every working day
Age of the respondent	Pearson Correlation	1	.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.556
	N	167	167
I fail to plan my lessons every working day	Pearson Correlation	.046	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.556	
	N	167	167

Interpretation

These two variables correlate at .046. Thus on a zero to one scale, the value is .046 indicates fairly strong correlation between the two variables and every faculty plan their lessons every working day.

3.2.3 Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I maintain high level of consistent performance	2.11	.689	167
I do not get time for self-learning	3.26	1.018	167

Interpretation: As the mean is 2.11 and 3.26 respectively for the two variables which was considered for the above variable.

The respondents agree that they maintain a high level of consistent performance in their workplace. But for the second one the mean is 3.26 that means situation is 50-50.

3.2.4 I maintain high level of consistent performance and Marital status Cross-tabulation				
Count				
		Marital status		
		1	2	Total
I maintain high level of consistent performance	1	14	11	25
	2	57	47	104
	3	13	19	32
	4	1	5	6
Total		85	82	167

Interpretation: 83.52% of the married faculty agree that they maintain a high level of consistent performance and 70.73% of spinsters agree the same.

3.2.5 Symmetric Measures					
		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.151	.074	1.964	.051[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.139	.076	1.805	.073[c]
N of Valid Cases		167			
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.					

3.2.5 Symmetric Measures					
		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.151	.074	1.964	.051[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.139	.076	1.805	.073[c]
N of Valid Cases		167			
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.					
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.					
c. Based on normal approximation.					

DESCRPTIVE STATISTICS

3.2.6Descriptive

I maintain high level of consistent performance								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Within 30	129	2.18	.690	.061	2.06	2.30	1	4
31-40	29	2.00	.598	.111	1.77	2.23	1	3
41-50	9	1.56	.726	.242	1.00	2.11	1	3
Total	167	2.11	.689	.053	2.01	2.22	1	4

Interpretation: Three different age groups are identified for the survey. But the total mean identified is 2.11 assuming that consistent performance is maintained among the faculty, but the range in this item is between 1 to 4.

3.2.7ANOVA					
I maintain high level of consistent performance					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.717	2	1.858	4.057	.019
Within Groups	75.121	164	.458		
Total	78.838	166			

Interpretation: Between groups the sum of squares are 3.717 and within groups the sum of squares 75.121. The p value is less than 0.05, hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

3.2.8 Multiple Comparisons						
I maintain high level of consistent performance Tukey HSD						
(I)Age of the respondent	(J) Age of the respondent	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Within 30	31-40	.178	.139	.407	-.15	.51
	41-50	.623*	.233	.023	.07	1.17
31-40	Within 30	-.178	.139	.407	-.51	.15
	41-50	.444	.258	.200	-.17	1.06
41-50	Within 30	-.623*	.233	.023	-1.17	-.07
	31-40	-.444	.258	.200	-1.06	.17
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

3.2.9 Marital status * I do not get time for self -learning

3.3.4 **Cross-tabulation**

Count							
		I do not get time for self- learning					
		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Marital status	1	4	24	25	24	8	85
	2	1	15	22	36	8	82
Total		5	39	47	60	16	167

Interpretation: 37.64% of married faculty disagree that they do not get time for self- learning and 53.65% of the spinsters disagree the same.

3.2.10 Symmetric Measures					
		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.164	.075	2.135	.034[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.165	.076	2.148	.033[c]
N of Valid Cases		167			
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.					

3.2.10 Symmetric Measures					
		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.164	.075	2.135	.034[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.165	.076	2.148	.033[c]
N of Valid Cases		167			
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.					
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.					
c. Based on normal approximation.					

4.0 Discussion

Researchers have now begun to examine college faculty members' pedagogical beliefs, decisions, and judgments during teaching in a systematic way (Fernandez-Balboa and Stiehl 1995). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) suggested that junior (i.e., pre-tenure) faculty are socialized into the institution through their interactions with peers, and especially with senior faculty. This requires a lot of planning. As the basic definition of planning bridge the gap to an initiation stage to development. Fernandez-Balboa and Stiehl (1995) identified generic components of pedagogical content knowledge that include knowledge about the subject matter, knowledge about students, knowledge about instructional strategies, knowledge about teaching context, and knowledge about teaching purposes. Supposedly, these strategies were directed at better ensuring the survival of the faculty member at the institution. Researchers argue that these professional collegial relationships influence workplace satisfaction (August &Waltman, 2004; Boice, 1993; Settles, Cortina, Malley, & Stewart, 2006; Smart, 1990; Xu, 2008). The issuesmost often examined and that have contributed to our knowledge and broad understanding of faculty members' work-life have included such areas as work and productivity (Fairweather, 1996; Layzell, 1996).

5.0 Findings

77.2% of the respondent are within the age group of 30 years of age and the overall mean and standard deviation is .558

83.52% of the married faculty agree that they maintain a high level of consistent performance and 70.73% of spinsters agree the same

37.64% of married faculty disagree that they do not get time for self- learning and 53.65% of the spinsters disagree the same.

Student's expectation, their way of learning, their participation and involment in class has crossed all boundaries. Hence to meet these challenges faculties have to be a step ahead.

Experienced faculty do possess a competitive advantage to cope up with the contemporary challenges.

Experience teacher teach subject matter differently than the less experiences one because of accumulated wisdom of practice.

6.0 Suggestions

1. Instructional intervention by the institution so that new things can be learnt.
2. Teaching effectiveness program for teachers by the institution.
3. Quality one has to be consistent and persistent throughout.

7.0 Conclusion

Quality is an abstract concept but it can be measured through different parameters in research. Today, knowledge quality is a upcoming concept which can be associated with faculty at large. As the field has become more competitive constant planning is the need of the hour. Women have to take this as a challenge and see that they are self- motivated to be constant learners and efficient planners. Professors with years of teaching experience often make commitments to certain pedagogies without ever questioning their own evolving and unfolding understanding of a particular phenomenon and their students' ability or inability to grapple with a content area the professor has already mastered (Feezel& Welch, 2000). Experienced faculty do have a competitive advantage. With their years of teaching experience they maintain consistent performance. But sometimes married faculty self- learning experience differs from spinsters. In this situation planning plays a vital role to maintain consistence performance among faculty.

References

1. Annis, L.F. (1989). 'Partners in teaching improvement', Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development 7(1), pp 7-12.
2. Grant, G. (1988). Teaching Critical Thinking. New York: Praeger.
3. Fernandez-Balboa, J. and Stiehl, J. (1995). The generic nature of pedagogical content knowledge among college professors', Teaching and Teacher Education 11 (3), pp 293-306.
4. Sullivan, L. (1983). 'Faculty development: A movement on the brink', The College Board Review 127(21) pp 29-31
5. Baiocco, S. and DeWaters, J. (1995). 'Futuristic faculty development', Academe 81, pp 38-39
6. Freezel, J., & Welch, S. A. (2000). What is new and different about the Scholarship of Teaching. Journal of Association for Communication, 29, pp 250- 256.
7. Fairweather, J. S. (1996). Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life, Allyn& Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.
8. Grant, G. (1988). Teaching Critical Thinking. New York: Praeger.
9. Shulman, L. (1987). 'Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform', Harvard Educational Review 57(1), pp 1-22.