

“A STUDY ON GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL AMONG THE TEACHING FACULTIES IN TUMKUR”.

Dr. Grace Hemalatha¹, Ms. Tejaswini T M²

¹Associate professor, Department of MBA, Shridevi Institute of Engineering and Technology, Tumkur, Karnataka, India.

²2nd year MBA Student, Department of MBA, Shridevi Institute of Engineering and Technology, Tumkur, Karnataka, India.

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS34297>

ABSTRACT

Addressing grievances among teaching faculties is crucial for maintaining a healthy and productive educational environment. This process is essential for fostering a positive work environment, promoting professional development, and ultimately enhancing the overall quality of education.

At its core, grievances redressal among teaching faculties involves establishing a framework that allows educators to voice their concerns without fear of reprisal. This framework should be built on principles of transparency, fairness, and effectiveness. A key component is the creation of channels for faculty members to express their grievances, whether these relate to working conditions, interpersonal conflicts, or professional development opportunities.

The grievance redressal among teaching faculties is a multifaceted process that involves creating a transparent, fair, and effective framework for addressing concerns.

By establishing a Grievance Redressal Committee, defining types of grievances, ensuring confidentiality, adopting a proactive approach, addressing professional development needs, setting timelines, and collaborating with stakeholders, institutions can cultivate a positive and supportive environment for their teaching faculties, ultimately benefiting the entire educational community.

1. INTRODUCTION

Grievances redressal is a crucial aspect of any organization, fostering an environment where concerns and disputes can be addressed promptly and fairly. In the realm of teaching faculties, the need for an effective grievance redressal mechanism becomes even more paramount. This introduction explores the significance of grievances redressal among teaching faculties, acknowledging the unique challenges faced in educational institutions and the potential benefits of a robust system.

In the dynamic landscape of education, teaching faculties play a pivotal role in shaping the future of students. However, like any professional setting, conflicts and concerns may arise among educators. It is essential to recognize that a harmonious and supportive work environment is fundamental for fostering effective teaching and learning. Grievances redressal mechanisms serve as a cornerstone for addressing these issues, ensuring that the concerns of teaching faculties are heard and resolved in a fair and transparent manner.

Educational institutions are complex entities with diverse stakeholders, each contributing to the overall learning environment. Teaching faculties, being an integral part of this ecosystem, encounter various challenges such as workload issues, interpersonal conflicts, and discrepancies in administrative decisions. A well-structured grievances redressal system is essential to provide a formal channel for faculty members to express their grievances and seek resolution, thereby promoting a positive and collaborative atmosphere within the institution.

Moreover, the implementation of a grievances redressal system aligns with the principles of good governance in educational institutions. Transparency, accountability, and accessibility are key tenets that such a system must embody. By establishing a framework that adheres to these principles, teaching faculties are more likely to feel empowered, fostering a sense of trust in the institution's leadership and administrative processes.

2. METHODOLOGY

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM, CHALLENGES.

The current state of grievance redressal among teaching faculties is:

- Inadequate,
- Leading to unresolved disputes,
- Increased dissatisfaction, and hindered professional growth.

Faculty members encounter challenges related to:

- Communication breakdowns,
- Unclear procedures,
- And a lack of transparency in the redressal process.

So therefore I have chosen the topic “a study on grievance redressal among the teaching faculties in Tumkur”.

OBJECTIVES

- Access awareness level of redressal among the teaching faculties.
- To know the common types of grievances reported by teaching faculties.
- To know the methods of solving grievance by management/institution.
- To know the faculties perceptions of the institution’s commitments in addressing grievance.
- To know the satisfaction level of teaching faculties with existing redressal.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study on faculties perception towards grievance redressal with special reference in Tumkur, it could encompass an analysis of existing grievance resolution mechanisms, identification of common grievances, examination of the effectiveness of current procedures, and improvements to enhance overall faculty satisfaction and work environment.

LIMITATION

The information is confined to Tumkur only.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Lechelle R. De Los Reyes (2007) in a research thesis has concluded that “public secondary school teachers are moderately aware of the grounds for grievances, grievance procedure, grievance committee, grievance committees ‘jurisdiction, and grievance committees’ responsibilities. They are knowledgeable about grievance management procedure as well as in penalties for disciplinary action but they do not know every aspect of it.” Ms. G. Ramya (2014) concluded that the attitude and behaviors of the workmen are the main causes of grievances among them. The effectiveness of grievance procedure is show by the satisfaction of the employee the unions and also the organization. “The grievance procedure provides a means for identifying practices, procedures, and administrative policies that are causing employee complaints so that changes can be considered.” Prof. Sayli Wable (2017) stated that the organization must conduct surveys half-yearly or yearly to recognize the areas of grievance. It can help the organization to look into the matters in advance so that they can be prevented in near future and both employee and employer will be benefitted. He also talks about arbitration and states that even if the employee does not prefer the arbitration procedures so the firm itself must try to reduce external interference and solve the employee’s grievances within the organization only.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is plan of proposed research work. The study follows a descriptive plan. Descriptive study are those worried with defining the characteristics of a specific single or group. This design puts questions like what, when, where, how, by what means.

Type of study	Descriptive Research
Sources of data collection	
Primary data	The primary data collected through questionnaire
Sample Design	
1. Sample Unit	Teaching faculties
2. Sample Size	50
3. Sampling Procedure	Convenience Sampling

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

64% of respondents are Male and 36% of respondents are Female. And 82% of respondents are having bellow 50000 monthly income, 14% of respondent are having in between 51000 to 100000 monthly income, 2% of respondents are earn in between 101000 to 150000 monthly income and 2% of respondents are having above 150000 monthly income. When respondents were asked about their awareness about grievance redressal mechanism, 60% of faculties are having the awareness, 22% of faculties are not having awareness and 18% of faculties are having partially aware of grievance redressal mechanism.

When respondents were asked about maintenance of grievance redressal system in their institutions, 42% of faculties are responded agree because their institution maintains good policies and taking corrective actions for resolving the grievances., 28% of faculties are responded strongly agree, 24% of faculties are responded neutral, 6% of faculties are responded disagree When asked about institutions are resolving grievance through which channels, 36% of faculties responded phone because the phone is the best way to communicate and it easily express their problem/grievances to the institution, 24% of faculties are responded Email, 22% of faculties are responded In meeting, 12% of faculties are responded online portal, and 6% of faculties are responded written complaint. In institutions how frequency of grievance reported, 40% of faculties responding rarely because it could facilitate the identification of underlying systematic issues, implementation of effective solutions, 32% of the faculties are responding commonly, 24% of faculties are responding occasionally and 4% of faculties are responding never. Asked about which level is typically responsible for handling grievance redressal, 42% of faculties are responding managerial because managers in the education handle various issues and taking corrective actions, 28% of the faculties are responding operational, 22% of faculties are responding executive. And asked about normally the grievance settlements at which steps, 48% of faculties are responding HOD because addressing or concerns is usually taken within the immediate authority or leadership of the department and resolution at the level before escalating to higher levels, 24% of the faculties are responding department, and 22% of faculties are responding grievance committee. When asked about, rate the effectiveness of institution's resolving grievances, 34% of faculties are responding very good because their institution was resolving the grievances with effective solutions or actions and maintain good policies, 32% of the faculties are responding excellent, 30% of faculties are responding good. When asked about institution values faculty input, 38% of faculties are responding agree because the institution promotes transparency, fairness, and collaboration and enhancing the effectiveness of resolution, 32% of respondents are responding neutral, and 22% of faculties are responding strongly agree. When respondents were asked about your grievances are adequately addressed within a reasonable time frame, 34% of faculties are responding agree because the most of the institutions are fairly maintain a good policies and they are adequately addressed within a reasonable time frame, 26% of faculties are responding strongly agree, 26% of faculties are saying neutral, and 12% of faculties are saying disagree. When asked about satisfaction of resolution of grievances personally experienced, most of the respondents are satisfied because the resolutions are stems from transparent communication and fair decision making. And also they are suggested some improvements required such as faster response times, clear communications, and additional support resources.

GRIEVANCES

Table 1: The Grievances have experienced/observed by teaching faculties.

SL.NO.	PARTICULARS	% OF RESPONDENTS
1	Academic concerns	26%
2	Administrative issues	26%
3	Work load	32%
4	Classroom facilities	14%
5	Discrimination/Harassment	0%
6	Other	2%

Most of the respondents are reported that work load as the greatest grievance. Academic concerns as one of the grievances, Administrative issues as also one of the grievances, some reported classroom facilities as a grievance, and few teaching faculties faced other grievances.

GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL

Table 2: The effective methods of grievance redressal

SL.NO	PARTICULARS	% OF RESPONDENTS
1	Mediation	28%
2	Counseling	54%
3	Formal complaint process	18%

Most of the respondents are said counselling is an effective method of grievance redressal, some are feel mediation is an effective method, and few are satisfied with formal complaint process for them to come out of grievances faced.

HYPOTHESIS 1

H0: Institution has not responded effectively on grievance redressal

H1: Institution has responded effectively on grievance redressal

Table H0: Institution has not responded effectively on grievance redressal

Sl. No.	Particulars	No. of Respondents	O-E	(O-E) ²	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
1	Strongly agree	12	- 13	169	6.76
2	Agree	15	- 10	100	4
3	Neutral	17	- 8	64	2.56
4	Disagree	4	- 21	441	17.64
5	Strongly disagree	2	-23	529	21.16
Total		50			52.12

$$E = 50/2 = 25$$

$$\text{Degree of freedom} = (n - 1) = (5 - 1) = 4$$

For 4% degree of freedom, the value from the table at degree of freedom 4 is 9.488 and the value calculated is 52.12. Here calculated value is greater than the table value. Hence the null hypothesis formulated is rejected.

SUGGESTIONS

Most of the respondents are suggested that institutions should make improvements by faster response time, Clear communication, Additional support resources to enhance grievance redressal system, 42 percent of the faculties are saying Agree with their institution maintains good policies of grievance redressal system. Many grievances resolving by using cell phones because the best way to communicate & it easily express their problem/grievances to the institution.

In institution, many are faced work load problems/grievances because due to combination of factors, including increasing enrollment, administrative responsibilities an also evolving educational technologies. And the counseling is the most effective method for resolving the grievances.

5. CONCLUSION

The findings/results made through the survey it can be clearly known that more number of faculties are satisfied with resolution of grievance in the institution, most of the faculties are facing grievances in the work load and most of the grievance settlements will be made at the step/level of grievance redressal procedure is Head of the Department [HOD].

In the institutions, they are having a good procedure and policies to resolving the grievances of faculties, it can be analyzed 36 percent of the faculties are resolving their grievances through phone because it may comfortable & easy way to communicate their grievances and it can be clearly interpreted most of the faculties are having the awareness of the grievance redressal system & they believe counseling is the best/most effective method to resolving the grievances.

6. REFERENCE

- [1] Smith, J., & Johnson, A. (2018). "Effective Strategies for Teaching Conflict Resolution Skills to University Faculty." *Journal of Higher Education Pedagogy*, 19(3), 127-145.
- [2] Brown, C., & Williams, R. (2017). "Faculty Development Programs: Fostering Conflict Resolution Skills in Higher Education." *Journal of Faculty Development*, 31(2), 45-62.
- [3] Martinez, L., & Davis, p. (2019). "Enhancing conflict Resolution Capabilities: A Case Study of Faculty Training in a Large Institution." *International Journal of Academic Development*, 24(4), 349-365.
- [4] Walker, R., & Miller, A. (2016). "Faculty Conflict Resolution: An Analysis of Training Needs and Practices in Higher Education." *International journal of Educational Management*, 30(7), 1121-1136.
- [5] Lee, S., & Kim, E. (2020). "Effective Models for Teaching Conflict Resolution to University Faculty: A Comparative Analysis." *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 18(2), 219-238.