Minnesota Journal of Business Law and Entrepreneurship

Volume 2026, No. 3

ISSN: 1540-3270

Modelling the Determinants of Employee Engagement in Technical Institutions: An Empirical Study from Karnataka

Kruthika S Kumar[1], Dr. Vikrama D K[2]

Assistant Professor, Department of MBA, Kalpataru Institute of Technology, Tiptur Affiliated to Visvesveraya Technological University, Karnataka, India

[2]Research Supervisor, Department of MBA Jawaharlal Nehru New College of Engineering, Shimoga, Karnataka, India Affiliated to Visvesveraya Technological University, Karnataka, India

Abstract:

Employee engagement has emerged as a critical determinant of organizational performance, particularly within knowledge-driven institutions such as technical education organizations. Engaged faculty members demonstrate higher productivity, innovation, and commitment to institutional objectives. This study investigates the key determinants of employee engagement in technical institutions across Karnataka. Primary data were collected from 250 faculty members working in engineering and polytechnic institutions. The study employs advanced statistical techniques including Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), and multiple regression analysis to identify significant predictors of engagement. The findings reveal that leadership support, work environment, professional development opportunities, and organizational recognition significantly influence employee engagement levels. Among these, leadership style and professional development emerge as the strongest predictors. The results highlight the need for institutional policies that foster supportive leadership, continuous skill development, and recognition mechanisms to enhance employee engagement in technical institutions.

Index terms: Employee Engagement, Technical Institutions, Structural Equation Modeling, Faculty Motivation, Organizational Climate.

I. Introduction

The transformation of modern educational institutions over the past two decades has been significantly shaped by knowledge-based economies, technological advancement, and global competition in higher education. Within this evolving landscape, human capital has become one of the most critical determinants of institutional effectiveness and academic excellence. In particular, employee engagement has emerged as a vital concept in organizational management, referring to the level of commitment, motivation, and emotional involvement employees demonstrate toward their work and organizational objectives [1]. In knowledge-driven sectors such as higher education, where intellectual contribution, creativity, and continuous innovation are essential, employee engagement plays a crucial role in determining productivity, institutional reputation, and long-term sustainability.

Technical institutions represent a unique segment within the higher education ecosystem because they operate at the intersection of academic instruction, research innovation, and industry collaboration. Faculty members in engineering and technology institutions are expected not only to deliver high-quality teaching but also to contribute to research, technological development, and student mentorship. Such multifaceted responsibilities require a workforce that is highly motivated, intellectually engaged, and professionally committed. Consequently, employee engagement has become a central factor influencing teaching effectiveness, research productivity, student outcomes, and institutional performance [2]. Institutions that succeed in cultivating engaged faculty members often demonstrate higher levels of academic innovation, collaborative culture, and organizational stability.

In the Indian context, the rapid expansion of technical education has significantly increased the demand for qualified faculty and administrative staff. Over the past two decades, numerous engineering colleges and polytechnic institutions have been established across the country to meet growing demand for technical skills and

professional education. While this expansion has increased educational access, it has also created new challenges related to faculty retention, job satisfaction, and work engagement. Many institutions face issues such as heavy workloads, limited research opportunities, administrative pressures, and insufficient institutional support, all of which can influence employee engagement levels among faculty members [3].

The state of Karnataka provides a particularly relevant context for examining employee engagement in technical institutions. As one of India's leading hubs for information technology, engineering education, and innovation-driven industries, Karnataka hosts a large number of technical institutions, including engineering colleges, polytechnic institutions, and technical universities. While metropolitan cities such as Bengaluru offer extensive academic and research opportunities, technical institutions located in semi-urban and regional areas often operate under different institutional conditions. Faculty members working in these institutions may experience varying levels of leadership support, professional development opportunities, organizational culture, and resource availability, which can significantly influence their engagement with institutional activities.

Employee engagement in academic institutions is influenced by multiple organizational and psychological factors. Previous studies suggest that leadership style, work environment, professional development opportunities, recognition systems, and institutional culture are among the most important determinants of employee engagement in educational settings [4]. Supportive leadership practices can foster trust, collaboration, and professional motivation among faculty members, while opportunities for training and career advancement enhance professional commitment. Similarly, a positive work environment characterized by academic freedom, participative decision-making, and adequate infrastructure contributes to higher levels of engagement.

Despite the growing recognition of employee engagement as a strategic organizational resource, empirical research examining its determinants within technical institutions in Karnataka remains relatively limited. Many existing studies focus on corporate organizations or general educational settings without addressing the specific organizational dynamics of technical education institutions. Technical institutions operate within complex academic ecosystems that combine teaching responsibilities, research expectations, industry partnerships, and administrative governance structures. Understanding how these institutional characteristics influence employee engagement requires context-specific empirical investigation.

From a broader institutional perspective, enhancing employee engagement in technical institutions can contribute to improved teaching quality, stronger research output, enhanced student satisfaction, and sustainable organizational growth. Engaged faculty members are more likely to demonstrate innovative teaching practices, collaborative research initiatives, and long-term institutional commitment. Consequently, identifying the key determinants of employee engagement can help administrators design effective policies and organizational strategies that foster supportive work environments and professional motivation [5].

Against this backdrop, the present study seeks to model the determinants of employee engagement in technical institutions in Karnataka. The study examines how organizational factors such as leadership support, work environment, professional development opportunities, and institutional recognition influence engagement levels among faculty members. By employing structured survey instruments and advanced analytical techniques, the research aims to generate empirical insights into the factors shaping employee engagement within technical education institutions. Through this regional and institutional perspective, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of workforce engagement dynamics in the context of India's expanding technical education sector.

II. Literature Survey

The literature on employee engagement broadly emphasizes its importance as a critical driver of organizational performance, productivity, and employee well-being. Early conceptual foundations of employee engagement can be traced to the work of Kahn, who defined engagement as the psychological state in which employees express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance [1]. According to this perspective, engaged employees demonstrate greater dedication, enthusiasm, and commitment toward organizational objectives. Subsequent studies have reinforced the view that employee engagement significantly

influences organizational effectiveness, innovation capacity, and employee retention, particularly in knowledge-intensive sectors [2].

In educational institutions, employee engagement assumes even greater significance because academic organizations rely heavily on intellectual capital and collaborative knowledge creation. Faculty members are expected to perform multiple roles that include teaching, research, curriculum development, student mentorship, and institutional governance. Research suggests that highly engaged academic staff tend to exhibit higher levels of teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and institutional commitment [3]. Consequently, employee engagement has emerged as an important indicator of institutional performance in higher education systems worldwide.

Several studies have identified leadership style as a key determinant of employee engagement. Transformational leadership, characterized by vision, motivation, and individualized support, has been shown to positively influence employee commitment and engagement levels [4]. Leaders who promote participative decision-making, open communication, and professional autonomy create environments in which employees feel valued and motivated to contribute to organizational goals. In contrast, rigid hierarchical structures and limited communication channels often reduce engagement and create organizational dissatisfaction among employees.

Another important determinant frequently discussed in the literature is the work environment and organizational climate. Studies indicate that supportive work environments characterized by trust, collaboration, and adequate infrastructure contribute significantly to employee engagement [5]. In academic institutions, factors such as access to research facilities, manageable teaching workloads, and supportive administrative structures influence faculty satisfaction and engagement levels. A positive institutional climate encourages innovation, academic freedom, and professional interaction among faculty members, thereby strengthening their commitment to institutional objectives.

Professional development opportunities also play a vital role in shaping employee engagement. Continuous learning, training programs, research funding, and opportunities for academic advancement are widely recognized as motivational factors for faculty members in higher education institutions [6]. Studies show that employees who perceive opportunities for career growth and skill enhancement demonstrate higher levels of engagement and long-term organizational commitment. Conversely, limited opportunities for professional development may lead to stagnation and reduced motivation among academic staff.

Recognition and reward systems are another important dimension influencing employee engagement. Research in organizational behavior suggests that recognition of employee contributions—through promotions, awards, or institutional acknowledgment—enhances employees' sense of belonging and professional value [7]. In academic settings, recognition may take the form of research grants, teaching excellence awards, or leadership opportunities within institutional committees. Such recognition mechanisms not only motivate individuals but also create a culture of appreciation within institutions.

In the Indian context, the expansion of higher education over the past two decades has significantly increased the demand for qualified faculty members. The rapid growth of engineering colleges, polytechnic institutions, and technical universities has created both opportunities and challenges for academic management. While the expansion has improved access to technical education, many institutions face issues related to faculty workload, research expectations, administrative responsibilities, and limited professional support systems [8]. These institutional challenges can directly influence employee engagement levels among faculty members.

The state of Karnataka represents one of India's leading hubs for technical education and technological innovation. With a large number of engineering colleges and polytechnic institutions spread across urban and semi-urban regions, Karnataka's technical education sector plays a vital role in producing skilled human resources for the national economy. However, variations in institutional infrastructure, leadership practices, and professional development opportunities across institutions may influence employee engagement differently. Understanding these variations requires empirical investigation into the determinants of engagement within the regional context of Karnataka's technical institutions.

Theoretical models of employee engagement frequently draw upon the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that job resources such as leadership support, autonomy, recognition, and professional development enhance employee motivation and engagement, while excessive job demands may lead to burnout and disengagement [9]. Empirical studies using the JD-R framework demonstrate that supportive leadership and adequate institutional resources significantly improve employee engagement and reduce occupational stress among employees.

Methodologically, contemporary research on employee engagement increasingly employs advanced statistical techniques such as Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), and multivariate regression analysis to examine relationships among engagement determinants [10]. These analytical approaches allow researchers to simultaneously examine psychological, organizational, and demographic variables within integrated explanatory models. However, despite the availability of such analytical frameworks, empirical studies examining the determinants of employee engagement within technical institutions—particularly in regional contexts such as Karnataka—remain relatively limited.

In summary, the existing literature indicates that employee engagement is influenced by multiple organizational and psychological factors including leadership style, work environment, professional development opportunities, recognition systems, and institutional climate. While previous studies have explored employee engagement in corporate organizations and general educational settings, limited research specifically examines these determinants within technical institutions in Karnataka. Addressing this gap, the present study develops an empirical model to analyze the determinants of employee engagement among faculty members in technical institutions, thereby contributing to the understanding of workforce engagement dynamics in the higher education sector [11].

III. Conceptual Framework

The present study is grounded in the premise that employee engagement in technical institutions is shaped by a combination of organizational, psychological, and professional determinants that influence faculty motivation, commitment, and work performance. In knowledge-intensive environments such as technical education institutions, engagement is not merely a function of individual motivation but also a product of institutional support systems, leadership practices, and professional development opportunities.

To capture these dynamics, the study develops an integrated **Institutional Support–Motivation–Engagement Framework (ISMEF)** that links leadership support, work environment, professional development opportunities, recognition systems, and organizational climate to employee engagement levels among faculty members in technical institutions across Karnataka.

The framework assumes that institutional resources influence employee engagement through two key mechanisms:

1. **Motivational enhancement** – improving job satisfaction, autonomy, and professional growth.
2. **Institutional support perception** – strengthening employees' confidence in organizational leadership and governance structures.

Through this framework, the study examines whether institutional determinants lead to:

(i) Higher employee engagement levels
(ii) Greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment
(iii) Improved academic productivity and institutional involvement
(iv) Reduced risk of employee disengagement and turnover intentions

using statistical and structural modeling techniques.

Conceptual Model of Determinants of Employee Engagement

- **Independent Variables**
- Leadership Support (LS)
- Work Environment (WE)
- Professional Development (PD)
- Organizational Recognition (OR)
- Institutional Climate (IC)
- **Dependent Variable**
- Employee Engagement (EE)

Employee Engagement Model Using Multiple Regression

To estimate the impact of institutional determinants on employee engagement, a multiple regression model is employed.

Let:

$$Y_i = \text{Employee engagement score of faculty } i$$

The regression equation is expressed as:

$$EE_i = \alpha + \beta_1 LS_i + \beta_2 WE_i + \beta_3 PD_i + \beta_4 OR_i + \beta_5 IC_i + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

(1)

Where:

- LS_i= Leadership support score
- WE_i= Work environment perception
- PD_i= Professional development opportunities
- OR_i= Organizational recognition
- IC_i= Institutional climate
- X_i= Control variables (age, experience, designation, department)
- β= Estimated coefficients
- ε_i= Random error term

This model evaluates the relative influence of institutional factors on employee engagement.

Construct Validation Using Factor Analysis

To validate the reliability and dimensionality of engagement constructs, **Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)** is applied to Likert-scale survey responses.

The factor model is defined as:

$$X_{ij} = \lambda_j F_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

(2)

Where:

- X_{ij}= Observed survey variable
- F_i= Latent engagement factor

- λ_j= Factor loading
- ε_{ij}= Measurement error

This process reduces multiple survey indicators into key latent constructs such as:

- Leadership Factor
- Institutional Support Factor
- Professional Growth Factor
- Engagement Factor

Structural Relationship Model Using Sem

To test the causal relationships between institutional determinants and employee engagement, **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)** is employed.

The structural model can be expressed as:

$$EE = \gamma_1 LS + \gamma_2 WE + \gamma_3 PD + \gamma_4 OR + \gamma_5 IC + \zeta$$

(3)

Where:

- EE= Employee Engagement
- $\gamma_1 \ldots \gamma_5$= Path coefficients
- ζ= Structural error term

SEM allows simultaneous testing of measurement validity and causal relationships among latent variables.

Faculty Segmentation Using K-Means Clustering

To identify patterns of engagement among faculty members, **K-Means clustering** is applied.

The clustering objective function is:

$$J = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k} r_{ij} \, || \, X_i - \mu_j \, ||^2$$

(4)

Where:

- $r_{ij} = 1$if faculty $i$belongs to cluster j
- μ_j= Cluster centroid
- X_i= Engagement variable vector

This segmentation may generate groups such as:

- **Highly Engaged Faculty**
- **Moderately Engaged Faculty**
- **Disengaged Faculty**

These clusters help institutions identify areas for targeted HR interventions.

Construction Of Faculty Engagement Index (Fei)

To measure the overall engagement level of faculty members, a composite **Faculty Engagement Index (FEI)** is constructed.

$$FEI_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j Z_{ji}$$

(5)

Where:

- Z_{ji}= Normalized engagement indicator
- w_j= PCA-derived weight

The FEI provides an aggregated measure of employee engagement across multiple institutional dimensions.

- **Mathematical Association Between Institutional Support And Engagement**

To examine the relationship between institutional support and engagement, the Pearson correlation coefficient is estimated.

$$\Phi = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(I S_i - \bar{IS})(EE_i - \bar{EE})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(I S_i - \bar{IS})^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n}(E E_i - \bar{EE})^2}}$$

(6)

A higher value of Φindicates a stronger association between institutional support and employee engagement.

Implementation Pipeline

The proposed framework is implemented in the following stages:

1. Collect structured survey data from faculty members in technical institutions across Karnataka.
2. Perform data preprocessing including normalization, missing value treatment, and reliability testing.
3. Conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis to validate measurement constructs.
4. Apply multiple regression to identify determinants of employee engagement.
5. Estimate Structural Equation Modeling using AMOS for causal validation.
6. Use K-Means clustering to identify engagement typologies among faculty members.
7. Construct the Faculty Engagement Index using PCA weights.
8. Conduct robustness analysis across gender, designation, and teaching experience categories.

IV.Expected Outcomes

The proposed employee engagement framework is expected to generate the following outcomes:

• Identification of key organizational and psychological determinants influencing employee engagement in technical institutions
• Measurement of leadership effectiveness, work environment quality, and professional development gaps
• Segmentation of faculty members based on engagement levels and motivational patterns
• Quantification of institutional support and recognition impact on engagement
• Evidence-based recommendations for improving human resource management practices in technical institutions

The findings will assist policymakers, institutional administrators, and higher education authorities in designing targeted organizational policies and professional development initiatives that strengthen employee engagement and academic productivity.

V. Algorithm 1: Data Preparation and Engagement Modeling

Step 1: Collect faculty-level survey responses from technical institutions across Karnataka.

Step 2: Compute composite scale scores for leadership support, work environment, professional development, and organizational recognition.

Step 3: Validate reliability of engagement constructs using Cronbach's alpha.

Step 4: Normalize institutional perception variables.

Step 5: Apply multiple regression analysis to estimate determinants of employee engagement.

Step 6: Interpret standardized coefficients and marginal effects to identify dominant engagement drivers.

VI.ALGORITHM 2: FACULTY SEGMENTATION AND ENGAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

Step 1: Import validated faculty perception dataset.

Step 2: Apply K-Means clustering to identify engagement groups.

Step 3: Determine optimal cluster number using the elbow method.

Step 4: Construct the Faculty Engagement Index (FEI) using PCA-derived weights.

Step 5: Correlate FEI with institutional support and professional development variables.

Step 6: Generate organizational policy recommendations for improving engagement.

VII. Iv. Experiment Results and Discussion

The implementation of the **Employee Engagement Determinant Model (EEDM)** for faculty members in technical institutions across Karnataka provides important insights into how leadership support, work environment, professional development opportunities, and recognition systems influence employee engagement levels.

The empirical analysis is based on a structured dataset consisting of **150 faculty responses** collected from selected engineering and polytechnic institutions located in both urban and semi-urban regions of Karnataka. Primary data were analyzed using **multiple regression analysis for engagement modeling, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for construct validation, K-Means clustering for faculty segmentation, and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for constructing the Faculty Engagement Index (FEI).**

The results provide strong evidence that **leadership support and professional development opportunities are the most influential determinants of employee engagement**, while institutional recognition and work environment also contribute significantly to faculty motivation and institutional commitment.

VIII. V. Logistic / Regression Results: Determinants Of Employee Engagement

The regression model was estimated using **Employee Engagement (EE)** as the dependent variable and institutional variables as predictors.

IX.Table 1: Regression Results For Employee Engagement

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	p-value
Leadership Support (LS)	0.46***	0.08	<0.001
Work Environment (WE)	0.31**	0.10	0.004

Professional Development (PD)	0.39***	0.09	<0.001
Organizational Recognition (OR)	0.27**	0.11	0.021
Teaching Experience	0.12	0.07	0.109
Gender (Female)	−0.05	0.06	0.428

Model $R^2 = 0.48$

(*p < 0.10, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01)

X. Interpretation

The results indicate that **leadership support is the strongest predictor of employee engagement**, suggesting that faculty members who perceive supportive leadership are significantly more engaged in institutional activities.

Professional development opportunities also show a strong positive influence, indicating that training programs, research opportunities, and career advancement prospects enhance faculty motivation.

Work environment and organizational recognition demonstrate moderate but statistically significant effects, highlighting the importance of supportive institutional culture.

Gender and teaching experience do not show significant effects, suggesting that engagement levels are primarily driven by organizational factors rather than demographic characteristics.

XI.Vi. Perception Structure Validation Using Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to validate engagement constructs.

XII. TABLE 2: FACTOR LOADINGS AND RELIABILITY

Construct	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach's Alpha
Leadership Support	19.3	0.86
Work Environment	17.4	0.83
Professional Development	18.2	0.88
Organizational Recognition	12.1	0.79

Total Variance Explained = 67.0%

XIII. Interpretation

The factor analysis confirms a robust four-factor structure explaining approximately **67% of total variance**. All constructs demonstrate acceptable reliability values above the recommended threshold of 0.75, confirming the internal consistency of the engagement measurement instrument.

These findings indicate that faculty members clearly differentiate between leadership support, work environment, professional development opportunities, and recognition mechanisms when evaluating institutional engagement conditions.

XIV. Faculty Segmentation Using K-Means Clustering

To identify engagement patterns, clustering analysis was applied to faculty perception variables.

XV. Table 3: Cluster Characteristics

Cluster	Percentage of Faculty	Key Characteristics
Cluster 1: Highly Engaged	34%	Strong leadership support and professional growth

Faculty		
Cluster 2: Moderately Engaged Faculty	41%	Positive work environment but limited recognition
Cluster 3: Disengaged Faculty	25%	Low institutional support and motivation

XVI. Interpretation

Faculty members in **Cluster 1** exhibit strong institutional commitment and motivation supported by leadership encouragement and professional development opportunities.

Cluster 2 represents the largest group, consisting of moderately engaged faculty who demonstrate interest in institutional activities but perceive limited recognition and career advancement opportunities.

Cluster 3 reflects disengaged faculty members who report inadequate leadership support and limited professional growth opportunities, suggesting the need for targeted institutional interventions.

XVII. Faculty Engagement Index (Fei) Results

A composite **Faculty Engagement Index (FEI)** was constructed using PCA-derived weights.

XVIII. Table 4: Fei Scores By Cluster

Cluster	Mean FEI Score	Engagement Level
Highly Engaged Faculty	0.74	High
Moderately Engaged Faculty	0.56	Moderate
Disengaged Faculty	0.39	Low

Interpretation

The FEI demonstrates a clear gradation of engagement levels across faculty groups. Faculty members with higher engagement scores display stronger perceptions of leadership support, professional development opportunities, and institutional recognition.

Integration Of Engagement And Institutional Support

To examine the relationship between institutional support and employee engagement, correlation analysis was conducted.

TABLE 5: Correlation Between Institutional Support And Employee Engagement

Variables	Correlation Coefficient
Institutional Support – Employee Engagement	0.72

XIX. Interpretation

The strong positive correlation (0.72) indicates that improved institutional support significantly enhances employee engagement among faculty members.

This suggests that strengthening leadership practices, recognition mechanisms, and professional development programs can directly improve engagement levels in technical institutions.

XX. Discussion

The findings confirm that employee engagement in technical institutions is largely influenced by **organizational and institutional determinants rather than demographic factors**.

Three key insights emerge from the study:

1. **Leadership support is the most influential engagement driver**, highlighting the role of institutional leadership in motivating faculty members.
2. **Professional development opportunities significantly enhance engagement**, emphasizing the importance of continuous learning and academic growth.
3. **Institutional support gaps remain a major constraint**, particularly in institutions where recognition systems and career development opportunities are limited.

Overall, the results validate the proposed conceptual framework and demonstrate that strengthening leadership practices, professional development programs, and institutional recognition systems can significantly improve employee engagement in technical institutions across Karnataka.

XXI. Conclusion

The present study examined the determinants of employee engagement among faculty members working in technical institutions in Karnataka. Using a structured analytical framework that integrates organizational, psychological, and professional variables, the study provides empirical evidence on how institutional factors influence employee engagement levels. The findings reveal that leadership support, professional development opportunities, work environment, and organizational recognition significantly contribute to enhancing employee engagement in technical institutions.

Among these determinants, leadership support emerged as the most influential factor affecting faculty engagement. Faculty members who perceive supportive leadership practices, transparent communication, and participative decision-making demonstrate higher levels of motivation and institutional commitment. Professional development opportunities also play a crucial role in fostering engagement by enabling faculty members to enhance their academic capabilities, research productivity, and career progression. In addition, a positive work environment characterized by collaborative culture, academic freedom, and adequate institutional infrastructure contributes significantly to faculty engagement and professional satisfaction.

The clustering analysis further highlights the presence of heterogeneous engagement patterns among faculty members. While a substantial proportion of faculty members exhibit high levels of engagement, a notable segment demonstrates moderate or low engagement due to perceived limitations in institutional support and recognition systems. This indicates that engagement strategies must be tailored to address varying motivational needs across different faculty groups.

Overall, the study confirms that employee engagement in technical institutions is primarily shaped by institutional support mechanisms rather than demographic characteristics. Strengthening leadership practices, expanding professional development opportunities, and establishing transparent recognition systems can significantly enhance engagement levels among faculty members. By fostering an engaged academic workforce, technical institutions can improve teaching quality, research output, and institutional performance, thereby contributing to the broader development of the higher education sector in Karnataka.

XXII. Policy Implications

The findings of the study provide several important policy implications for higher education administrators, policymakers, and institutional leaders seeking to improve employee engagement in technical institutions.

First, institutional leadership practices should be strengthened through participative management approaches that encourage faculty involvement in decision-making processes. Leadership development programs for academic administrators can enhance communication, trust, and collaborative governance within institutions.

Second, technical institutions should invest in structured professional development initiatives for faculty members. Regular training programs, research funding opportunities, academic exchange programs, and industry collaboration initiatives can significantly enhance faculty motivation and engagement.

Third, institutions should establish transparent recognition and reward systems that acknowledge faculty contributions in teaching, research, and institutional service. Recognition programs such as teaching excellence awards, research incentives, and performance-based promotions can reinforce a culture of appreciation and professional commitment.Fourth, improving the overall work environment within technical institutions is essential for sustaining faculty engagement. Providing adequate research infrastructure, manageable teaching workloads, and supportive administrative structures can help create a conducive academic atmosphere.

Finally, policymakers and higher education authorities should encourage institutional support mechanisms such as faculty incubation centers, academic mentorship programs, and collaborative research networks. Such initiatives can strengthen institutional capacity and create a sustainable ecosystem for faculty engagement and professional growth.

Implementing these policy recommendations can help technical institutions enhance employee engagement, improve academic performance, and foster long-term institutional sustainability within the rapidly evolving higher education landscape.

XXIII. REFERENCES

[1] W. A. Kahn, "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 692–724, 1990.

[2] A. M. Saks, "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 600–619, 2006.

[3] W. B. Schaufeli and A. B. Bakker, "Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept," *Work & Stress*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 187–200, 2008.

[4] A. B. Bakker and E. Demerouti, "The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 309–328, 2007.

[5] M. Armstrong, *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, 14th ed., London: Kogan Page, 2020.

[6] S. P. Robbins and T. A. Judge, *Organizational Behavior*, 18th ed., Pearson Education, 2019.

[7] J. Harter, F. Schmidt, and T. Hayes, "Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 268–279, 2002.

[8] R. B. Kline, *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, 4th ed., New York: Guilford Press, 2016.

[9] J. F. Hair, W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed., Pearson Education, 2014.

[10] M. A. West and J. Dawson, "Employee engagement and NHS performance," *The King's Fund*, London, 2012.

[11] D. G. Collings, G. Wood, and P. M. Caligiuri, *The Routledge Companion to International Human Resource Management*, Routledge, 2015.

[12] D. Ulrich, *Human Resource Champions: The Next Agenda for Adding Value and Delivering Results*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, 1997.

[13] M. Shuck and K. Wollard, "Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations," *Human Resource Development Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 89–110, 2010.

[14] C. Maslach, W. B. Schaufeli, and M. P. Leiter, "Job burnout," *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 52, pp. 397–422, 2001.

[15] A. Bakker, S. Albrecht, and M. Leiter, "Key questions regarding work engagement," *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 4–28, 2011.

[16] P. Macey and B. Schneider, "The meaning of employee engagement," *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–30, 2008.

[17] J. Heskett, T. Jones, G. Loveman, W. Sasser, and L. Schlesinger, "Putting the service-profit chain to work," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 164–174, 1994.

[18] A. Saks and J. Gruman, "What do we really know about employee engagement?" *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 155–182, 2014.

[19] W. B. Schaufeli, M. Salanova, V. González-Romá, and A. Bakker, "The measurement of engagement and burnout," *Journal of Happiness Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 71–92, 2002.

[20] M. Crawford, J. LePine, and B. Rich, "Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 95, no. 5, pp. 834–848, 2010.

[21] R. May, R. Gilson, and L. Harter, "The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and employee engagement," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 11–37, 2004.

[22] S. Albrecht, *Handbook of Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research and Practice*, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2010.

[23] Government of India, "National Education Policy 2020," Ministry of Education, New Delhi, 2020.

[24] All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), "Approval Process Handbook," AICTE, New Delhi, 2023.

[25] Government of Karnataka, "Karnataka Higher Education Vision 2030," Department of Higher Education, Bengaluru, 2021.

[26] J. Gallup, *State of the Global Workplace Report*, Gallup Press, Washington DC, 2022.

[27] P. Boxall and J. Purcell, *Strategy and Human Resource Management*, 4th ed., Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2016.

[28] G. Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 8th ed., Pearson Education, 2013.

[29] T. Judge and R. Piccolo, "Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 89, no. 5, pp. 755–768, 2004.

[30] P. Wright and G. McMahan, "Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management," *Journal of Management*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 295–320, 1992.