

A Study of Growth Opportunities And Work Environment Influence On The Faculty Attrition At Higher Educational Institutions

Dr. Manisha Shukla,

Associate Professor,

Bharati Vidyapeeth's Institute of Management Studies and Research, Navi Mumbai.

manishadebeylko@gmail.com

Dr. Govind Shinde,

Professor,

Maratha Mandir's Babasaheb Gawde Institute of Management Studies, Mumbai.

drshindegp@gmail.com

Abstract: There has been drastic changes in the education system in Indian Subcontinents. The introduction of technology and MOOC's has led to improvement in the quality of teaching at all the level of education system. But amidst such a transformation in the education system, one parameter that remains untouched are factors that lead to rise in the faculty attrition at higher educational institutes. Keeping this in mind the study was conducted in various management institutes affiliated to University of Mumbai. *The study aims to find out the influence of growth opportunities and work environment on the faculty attrition at higher educational institutes. These findings can assist in developing strategies to manage faculty attrition.*

Keywords: Faculty Attrition, Growth Opportunity and Work Environment

Introduction

Faculty attrition is one of the significant areas of concern for all Institutes and universities across the world. Faculty positions are always considered as a designation associated with an excessive amount of dedication and respect, but less paid as compared to an industrial job.

The difference in pay as compared to the industry at the preceding stage of faculty career starts affecting the faculty. Due to this faculty after a certain year of experience

start searching for jobs either as a faculty or in industry. Besides its faculty members inevitably are in search of growth opportunity and a better work environment to work in that can provide motivation to work in a job.

The faculty is an important component of every institute and the growth trajectory is largely dependent on the quality of faculty available. There has been a huge mismatch in the growing demand for faculty with the corresponding availability of quality faculty, resulting in faculty attrition. Faculty attrition has quantifiable dire consequences for the nation's quality of technical educations. Many educational institutions constantly struggle to maintain and rebuild the staff continuity. The talent and acumen remain stored in a leaky bucket. An inordinate amount of their capital – both human and financial – is consumed by the constant process of hiring and replacing faculty who leave before mastering the art of creating a cohesive learning culture for the students. The organizations constantly spend and re-spend its resources on grooming fresh talent that acquires professional know how and exits the system for a better opportunity. This leads to complete wastage of all the capital consumed by the recruitment and training process. As a result of high turnover, institutions are often staffed with unbalanced concentrations of under-prepared, inexperienced teachers who are left on their own to meet student needs. As a consequence of this isolation, many new teachers feel overwhelmed by the challenge they face, eventually leaving their current workplace.

The need of the hour for institutions is to be aware of their attrition problems. The absence of a clear understanding of the attrition trends often leads to costly annual recruitment and hiring cycle, bringing in more and more faculty into institutions only to lose them with an equally fast rate. The process is bound to drain the institutions both, financially and intellectually leading to wider student achievement gaps. Hence the current study tries to understand the various costs involved in the faculty attrition with specific focus on the indirect and opportunity costs.

Education is a sector associated with continuous knowledge upgradation, learning, development and at the same time delivering the best performance. There has always been controversy with respect to the most preferred work destination; between the government universities / institutes and the private universities or institutes. While there hold some pros and cons associated with working in private and the government, academic organization; both have been attracting potential employees at their end. While some consider the private organization to be best for frequent opportunities to change from one organization to another, some believe government organizations to be the best platform for work and easy work –life balance. The researcher has made efforts to bring forth the difference in the two sectors associated with the academics.

Literature Review

Hughes (1991) in his research found professional growth as fundamental motivators and component of teachers career development that gives them effectiveness and satisfaction in teaching. Teacher job satisfaction is frequently associated with burnout, work quality and professionalism. A study by Gill (1992) reported that six of the top seven reasons for faculty departing were intangible benefits such as research opportunities; higher compensation levels increased the retention of assistant and associate professors, but had no effect on retaining professors. (Shetty, 2012)

The education system in India is much more improved these days and is one of the leading ones in the world. Besides various government initiatives, the role of the private institutions in the development of education industry in India cannot be denied. At present, India's private education market worth \$68 billion. Now with the sudden spurt in the number of private colleges/institutes/universities providing professional education in the recent past has resulted in the increased demand of highly qualified professionals in the market. Thereby, a large number of faculties are required by these institutes for their curriculum development and academic deliverance. Again the lucrative opportunities available in the corporate sector exert a pull on the existing faculty towards the corporate career from academic profession.(Maheshwari, 2012)

Employee's turnover is a widely researched phenomenon. A huge amount of theoretical and empirical literature identified various factors/reasons responsible for employees' turnover. However, there is no standard reason why people leave organization (Ongori, 2007)(Maheshwari, 2012).

Faculty members may decide to go into the business sector because of increased salaries, improved working conditions, and higher status (Markham, 1991). Professors with strong credentials have increased numbers of opportunities in or out of academia, as recognized by Zhou and Volkwein (2004) who stated, "Higher income and reduced emphasis on publication may make nonacademic employment attractive to some Ph.D.s."

Objective of the Study:

The study was undertaken with the following objectives:

1. To study the effect of Financial Benefits and Work Environment on the Faculty Members Attrition.
2. To study the effect of growth opportunities on the Faculty Members Attrition.

Research Methodology

The data for the study have been collected from primary sources-faculty members of the Institution. For the purpose of collection of primary data, a structured questionnaire has been used.

A total of 500 questionnaires was distributed to the respondents (faculty members of self financed professional institutions.), but out of the 260 responses were received, but after screening, finally 250 usable questionnaires have been analyzed.

Data has been analyzed using SPSS Version-20 which is available in the institute. The analysis involves cross tables with chi-square tests, t-tests, ANOVA and correlation, etc.

HYPOTHESIS

The study was carried out with following hypothesis:

Hypothesis

1. Institutions having supportive and encouraging environment have low incidence of attrition.
2. Institutions having growth opportunities for faculty members have low attrition.

The technique used for testing the hypothesis is Chi-Square Test, Correlations, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Frequency and Distribution used to test the hypothesis.

Results and Discussion:

Reliability and Validity of Scales: All the scales used in the study has been tested for their reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha.

Table No. 1.1: Reliability – Work Environment

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.960	.960	16

Table No. 1.2: Item-Total Statistics – Work Environment

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Orientation/Induction Programme	56.63	151.423	.781	.705	.957
Interpersonal Relationship	56.46	156.064	.734	.696	.958
Supervision/ Guidance	56.46	151.197	.846	.829	.956
Social & Cultural Activities	56.32	154.636	.699	.768	.958
Conflict Management	56.66	153.790	.675	.669	.958
Communication	56.58	152.301	.803	.837	.956
Decision Making	56.64	149.277	.843	.839	.955
Trust	56.63	147.800	.789	.828	.956
Rewards	56.99	147.104	.823	.839	.956
Appreciation for work initiatives	56.90	146.428	.832	.869	.956
Innovation and Change	56.83	148.978	.857	.804	.955
Interpersonal relations with Seniors/ Peers / Juniors	56.46	154.201	.785	.786	.957
Freedom to Work	56.37	156.090	.644	.785	.959
Working Environment	56.40	152.538	.761	.831	.957
Recognition & Reward for work	56.84	146.957	.837	.869	.955
Support from Administrative Staff	56.66	157.806	.464	.496	.963

Table No. 1.3: Reliability – Job Satisfaction

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.973	.973	31

Table No. 1.4: Item-Total Statistics – Job Satisfaction

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Separate Cabin for each faculty	118.60	670.483	.541	.973

Separate Staff Room	118.42	674.100	.659	.972
Air Conditioned Cabin / Staff Room	118.41	666.669	.620	.972
Computer/ Internet / Wi-Fi facilities	118.50	660.500	.759	.972
Journals availability	118.47	663.897	.739	.972
Printer Facility	118.77	652.685	.736	.972
Cafeteria	119.19	650.003	.716	.972
Local Transport facility	119.13	655.882	.658	.972
Leave facility (Casual Leave/Medical Leave)	118.63	666.291	.667	.972
Reprographic (Xerox) facility	118.64	660.449	.709	.972
Required books from library	118.24	682.569	.550	.973
Telephone/Fax facility	118.82	652.379	.764	.972
Stationery facility	118.84	652.138	.746	.972
Rest (Wash) rooms facility	119.16	642.306	.804	.971
Sports facilities	119.10	663.271	.672	.972
Medical facility	119.27	657.717	.681	.972
Current Pay	119.22	657.632	.681	.972
Maternity/Paternity leave	119.13	658.787	.635	.972
Vacation	118.92	656.757	.712	.972
Travel time to work place	118.89	663.032	.614	.973
Ambience	118.66	667.713	.711	.972
Work Appreciation & Recognition	118.99	658.594	.756	.972
Salary Increments	119.20	648.343	.820	.971
Faculty Development Programmes	119.10	651.708	.801	.971
Attending Workshops, Seminars & Conferences	118.99	653.827	.790	.972
Research facilities	118.98	653.943	.815	.971
Sponsorships/ Funding	119.23	649.159	.831	.971
Leadership	118.80	656.544	.802	.972

Appraisal & Promotion Policy	119.20	645.807	.823	.971
Institution Brand Image	118.83	659.442	.845	.971
Support by Institute for encouraging Faculty’s Overall Development	118.88	649.263	.839	.971

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: Institutions having supportive and encouraging environment have low incidence of attrition.

Table No. 1.5(a): Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %) - Work Environment

			Work Environment			Total
			Poor	Average	Very Good	
Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)	Up to 25%	Count	0	0	34	34
		%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	13.6%
	26-50%	Count	0	15	131	146
		%	0.0%	30.0%	68.6%	58.4%
	51-75%	Count	4	30	26	60
		%	44.4%	60.0%	13.6%	24.0%
	Above 75%	Count	5	5	0	10
		%	55.6%	10.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Total		Count	9	50	191	250
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table No. 1.5(b): Chi-Square Tests -Work Environment and Attrition

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	135.156 ^a	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	106.339	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	89.133	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .36. There is a significant association between Work Environment and Attrition (P=0.000). Table 5.4 (a) shows that faculty with poor Work Environment have high Attrition rate and the faculty with good or very good Work Environment have low Attrition rate. This result is further corroborated by the correlations of each aspect of Work Environment with Rate of Attrition [table: 5.4 (c)]. All the correlations shown in the table are negative meaning that with higher scores on work environment the rate of attrition is low and vice-versa.

Table No. 1.5(c): Correlations between Work Environment and Attrition

Correlations

Work Environment		Percentage (Likelihood of Leaving in %)	Attrition
F2.1 Orientation/Induction Programme	Pearson Correlation	-.664**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.2 Interpersonal Relationship	Pearson Correlation	-.607**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.3 Supervision/ Guidance	Pearson Correlation	-.655**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.4 Social & Cultural Activities	Pearson Correlation	-.594**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.5 Conflict Management	Pearson Correlation	-.567**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.6 Communication	Pearson Correlation	-.614**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.7 Decision Making	Pearson Correlation	-.643**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.8 Trust	Pearson Correlation	-.684**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.9 Rewards	Pearson Correlation	-.747**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.10 Appreciation for work initiatives	Pearson Correlation	-.666**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.11 Innovation and Change	Pearson Correlation	-.649**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.12 Interpersonal relations with Seniors/ Peers / Juniors	Pearson Correlation	-.597**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.13 Freedom to Work	Pearson Correlation	-.539**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.14 Working Environment	Pearson Correlation	-.620**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.15 Recognition & Reward for work	Pearson Correlation	-.699**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	250	
F2.16 Support from Administrative Staff	Pearson Correlation	-.354**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

N	250
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).	

In all the tables above higher satisfaction with the conditions in the Institution is associated with a low rate of attrition.

Hypothesis 2: Institutions having growth opportunities for faculty members have low attrition.

Table No. 1.6(a): Faculty Development Programmes * Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)

			Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)				Total
			Up to 25%	26-50%	51-75%	Above 75%	
Faculty Development Programmes	Highly Dissatisfied	Count	0	0	9	2	11
		%	0.0%	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%
	Dissatisfied	Count	0	15	16	5	36
		%	0.0%	41.7%	44.4%	13.9%	100.0%
	Little Satisfied	Count	0	27	16	3	46
		%	0.0%	58.7%	34.8%	6.5%	100.0%
Somewhat Satisfied	Count	3	56	13	0	72	
	%	4.2%	77.8%	18.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
Highly Satisfied	Count	31	48	6	0	85	
	%	36.5%	56.5%	7.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total		Count	34	146	60	10	250
		%	13.6%	58.4%	24.0%	4.0%	100.0%

Table No. 1.6(b): Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	119.273 ^a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	126.093	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	88.110	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. . cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .44.

There is a significant association between growth opportunities and attrition. Institutions having satisfactory FDP have low attrition.

Table No. 1.6(c): Attending Workshops, Seminars & Conferences * Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)

			Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)				Total
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	-------

			Up to 25%	26-50%	51-75%	Above 75%	
Attending Workshops, Seminars & Conferences	Highly Dissatisfied	Count	0	3	9	0	12
		%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Dissatisfied	Count	0	6	14	7	27
		%	0.0%	22.2%	51.9%	25.9%	100.0%
	Little Satisfied	Count	0	19	14	3	36
		%	0.0%	52.8%	38.9%	8.3%	100.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	Count	11	61	14	0	86
		%	12.8%	70.9%	16.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	Highly Satisfied	Count	23	57	9	0	89
		%	25.8%	64.0%	10.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	34	146	60	10	250
		%	13.6%	58.4%	24.0%	4.0%	100.0%

Table No. 1.6(d): Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	107.352 ^a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	101.618	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	71.781	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 9 cells (45.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .48.

Table No. 1.6(e): Research facilities * Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)

			Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)				Total	
			Up to 25%	26-50%	51-75%	Above 75%		
Research facilities	Highly Dissatisfied	Count	0	3	9	2	14	
		%	0.0%	21.4%	64.3%	14.3%	100.0%	
	Dissatisfied	Count	0	5	5	8	18	
		%	0.0%	27.8%	27.8%	44.4%	100.0%	
	Little Satisfied	Count	0	16	23	0	39	
		%	0.0%	41.0%	59.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Somewhat Satisfied	Count	6	75	15	0	96	
		%	6.2%	78.1%	15.6%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Highly Satisfied	Count	28	47	8	0	83	
		%	33.7%	56.6%	9.6%	0.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	34	146	60	10	250
			%	13.6%	58.4%	24.0%	4.0%	100.0%

Table No. 1.6(f): Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	178.257 ^a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	134.248	12	.000

Linear-by-Linear Association	87.193	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	250		
a. 9 cells (45.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .56.			

Table No. 1.6(g) : Appraisal & Promotion Policy * Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)

			Percentage Attrition (Likelihood of Leaving in %)				Total
			Up to 25%	26-50%	51-75%	Above 75%	
Appraisal & Promotion Policy	Highly Dissatisfied	Count	0	5	19	2	26
		%	0.0%	19.2%	73.1%	7.7%	100.0%
	Dissatisfied	Count	0	5	12	5	22
		%	0.0%	22.7%	54.5%	22.7%	100.0%
	Little Satisfied	Count	0	31	17	3	51
		%	0.0%	60.8%	33.3%	5.9%	100.0%
	Somewhat Satisfied	Count	6	57	5	0	68
		%	8.8%	83.8%	7.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	Highly Satisfied	Count	28	48	7	0	83
		%	33.7%	57.8%	8.4%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	34	146	60	10	250
		%	13.6%	58.4%	24.0%	4.0%	100.0%

Table No. 1.6(h): Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	137.947 ^a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	136.893	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	92.354	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 7 cells (35.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .88.

Findings

1. There is a significant association between Work Environment and Attrition (P=0.000). Faculty members with poor Work Environment have high Attrition rate and the faculty members with good or very good Work Environment have a low Attrition rate. This result is further corroborated by the correlations of each aspect of Work Environment with Rate of Attrition. All the correlations were negative that means with the highest score on work environment the rate of attrition is low and vice-versa.
2. There is a significant association between growth opportunities and attrition. Institutions having satisfactory FDP have low attrition.

Conclusion

The study has revealed that all the parameters selected for the study are important & critical for solving the faculty attrition problem. They include Salary & Incentives, Working Environment, Physical Environment and Learning Opportunities, Recognition & Appreciation, Growth Opportunities & Incentives for hard work. The major factors responsible for faculty attrition in management institutes are Growth opportunity and Infrastructural facilities, etc., the problem of faculty attrition could be controlled substantially. Considering faculty as talent and establishing effective talent management practices with focus on development & learning opportunities and performance-based rewards would reduce attrition. A facilitating working environment may positively result in internal growth of faculties. With effective practices of learning and growth opportunities, quality faculties can be built within the management institutions which would help in building a leadership position of the institution while also achieving internal career growth aligned with the vision and strategies of the institution.

References

1. Maheshwari, R. (2012). Managing the Attrition Rate of Faculty Members in Self Financed Professional. *AIMA Journal of Management and Research*, 6(4).
2. Shetty, B. R. (2012). A Study Of Faculty Job Satisfaction And Its Impact On Student Satisfaction In Management Institutes Of Nashik District Affiliated To University Of Pune. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 3(4), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-0340108>
3. https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/forward/documents/Benz_-_NDSU_Faculty_Turnover_Study.pdf