

Empirical Insights into Shift-Based Faculty Inequity in Self-Financing Colleges

Dr. S. Subbulakshmi

Assistant Professor, Shri Krishnaswamy College for Women, Chennai-600 040

Abstract

This study investigates the structural inequities between faculty members of Shift I and Shift II in self-financing colleges. Using a mixed-methods system, the study analyzes differences in workload, remuneration, qualifications, and professional development opportunities. The experimental findings reveal pronounced disparities, with Shift II faculty facing higher workloads, lower pay, and limited career advancement, reflecting systemic inequities embedded in the dual-shift model.

Keywords: Structural Inequities, Professional Development Opportunities, Dual-Shift Employment Model, Academic Labor Inequality and Mixed-Methods Study

1. Introduction

In the background of Indian higher education, self-financing colleges play a vital role in accommodating the rising demand for tertiary education. These institutions often operate in dual shifts—Shift I (daytime) and Shift II (evening)—to maximize resource use and increase student intake. However, the dual-shift system raises questions about equity and integrity in faculty treatment, especially in urban centers.

1.1 Research Problem

Despite sharing similar academic responsibilities, circumstantial and preliminary reports suggest that faculty members in Shift II face institutional disadvantages in comparison to their Shift I counterparts.

2. Objectives of the Study

- To assess demographic and academic differences between Shift I and Shift II faculty.
- To analyze disparities in salary, workload, and benefits.
- To identify variations in job satisfaction and professional development access.
- To offer empirical evidence to support policy reforms.

3. Literature Review

- **Tilak (2008)** found that the liberalization of India's education policy in the 1990s paved the way for a surge in self-financing institutions. In Tamil Nadu, many colleges agreed a **dual-shift system**—Shift I and Shift II to accommodate increasing enrollment without proportional infrastructural expansion (NIEPA, 2015).
- **Altbach (2003); Sharma & Sharma(2010)** highlighted the growing **dualism** in academic employment. Shift-based systems often reproduce inequities in terms of job security, benefits, and workload.
- Permanent faculty in Shift I enjoy stable salaries and career growth, whereas Shift II faculty typically face insecure contracts, lower salaries, higher teaching loads, limited access to research opportunities (**Varghese, 2009**)
- **Altbach (2003)** found that temporary and adjunct faculty in Indian colleges experience a lack of academic freedom and participation in governance.
- **Jayaram (2004)** emphasized that contract-based employment, often characteristic of Shift II, limits scholarly engagement and hampers research productivity.
- **Kaur & Malhotra (2020)** in Punjab observed that faculty in evening shifts were less likely to be involved in curriculum development or policy decisions, reflecting structural marginalization.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

A descriptive-comparative design using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

4.2 Sample

- 100 faculty members from five prominent self-financing colleges.
- 50 from Shift I and 50 from Shift II.

4.3 Tools for Data Collection

- Structured questionnaire (Likert scale)
- Semi-structured interviews

5. Data Analysis and Results

5.1 Demographic Characteristics

- **Shift I Faculty:** Predominantly Ph.D. holders with longer teaching tenures.
- **Shift II Faculty:** Younger, mostly holding master's degrees.

5.2 Workload and Compensation

Variable	Shift I (Mean)	Shift II (Mean)	p-value
Weekly Teaching Hours	16 hrs	20 hrs	< 0.001
Monthly Salary	₹45,000	₹30,000	< 0.001

5.3 Job Satisfaction and Career Advancement

- **Job Satisfaction:** 40% of Shift II faculty reported dissatisfaction.
- **Promotion Access:** Only 30% of Shift II staff was eligible for promotion, compared to 70% in Shift I.

5.4 Thematic Analysis

- **Theme 1: Inequity in Recognition** – Shift II faculty reported being excluded from administrative meetings.
- **Theme 2: Professional Isolation** – Fewer workshops and research opportunities were available to evening shift faculty.
- **Theme 3: Job Insecurity** – Contracts for Shift II staff were often semester-based, unlike permanent roles in Shift I.

6. Data-Based Analysis

This section presents the empirical results derived from statistical analysis of data collected from faculty members in Shift I and Shift II. The findings are organized into five key dimensions: demographic profile, workload, compensation, job satisfaction, and career advancement.

6.1 Demographic Profile

Variable	Shift I (n=50)	Shift II (n=50)
Mean Age (Years)	42.6	34.8
Male (%)	60%	70%
Female (%)	40%	30%
Master's Degree (%)	70%	90%
Ph.D. (%)	30%	10%
Avg. Teaching Experience	11.2 years	5.8 years

Interpretation: Shift II staff are generally younger, more male-dominated, and less likely to hold a Ph.D. or extensive teaching experience.

6.2 Workload and Compensation

Variable	Shift I (Mean \pm SD)	Shift II (Mean \pm SD)	t-value	p-value
Weekly Teaching Hours	16 \pm 2	20 \pm 3	7.21	<0.001
Monthly Salary (INR)	₹45,000 \pm ₹5,000	₹30,000 \pm ₹4,000	14.14	<0.001

Interpretation: Shift II faculty not only teach more hours but are also underpaid, highlighting a significant economic and labor disparity.

6. Discussion

The dual-shift system, while efficient in maximizing college infrastructure, fosters institutional discrimination. Using **Equity Theory**, the study shows that perceived unfairness in workload and reward leads to demotivation and reduced productivity among Shift II staff. The qualitative data validate these findings, pointing to a need for structural reform.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations Conclusion

This research confirms significant and systemic inequities between Shift I and Shift II faculty in self-financing colleges. These disparities undermine staff morale and educational quality.

Recommendations

- Standardize pay scales across shifts.
- Offer equal access to research, training, and promotion.
- Establish transparent, merit-based performance appraisals.
- Include Shift II faculty in institutional decision-making.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). *Toward an Understanding of Inequity*. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Sage.
- Jayaram, N. (2004). *Higher Education in India: Massification and Change*. Economic and Political Weekly.
- Kaur, R., & Malhotra, M. (2020). *Faculty Equity and Shift-Based Disparities in Private Colleges of Punjab*. Indian Journal of Education and Management.
- Tilak, J. B. G. (2008). *Transition from State to Market Financing of Higher Education in India*. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration.
- Varghese, N. V. (2009). *Private Sector in Higher Education: A Global Trend and Indian Perspectives*. IIEP-UNESCO.
- Tilak, J. B. G. (2012). *Higher Education, Public Good and Social Justice*. Economic and Political Weekly.