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REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Faculties are the key to the success of an institution. Faculty retention is one of the challenges facing many institutions today. Strategic staffing has become a concern because the ability to hold on highly talented faculties can be crucial to future survival. The time is tough. There is no denial to the fact that in today's fast pace and knowledge boom, one of the most important factors for today's organization is talent. Its viewed that the availability of suitable and competent talent inside any organization determines the excellence of the same. The quality of the faculties an institute possesses is one of the determinant factors in its growth. As a result of this war for talent; hiring and retaining good faculties have become the major concerns of institutions.

Best Faculty Retention Practices: A Review of the Literature

Our primary concern in reviewing this literature was to produce a typology of the many types of HR interventions that are associated, in the literature, with potentially good Faculty retention. This typology was instrumental in the development of a conceptual framework for identifying, selecting and ultimately documenting “best practices” institution for this study. A list of retention practices that captures the main types of interventions discussed in the Review of literature are as follows:

1. Compensation and Emoluments
2. Geographical location of Institute
3. Work culture
4. Career Development
5. Promotion
6. Work-Life Balance
7. External Climate
8. Employee Participation & Communication
9. Employee Engagement
According to Tariq Rahim Soomro & Reyaz Ahmad (2013) Criteria for retaining or firing a highly qualified faculty in higher education in many cases are vague and unclear. This situation is neither a comfortable, nor a healthy, both for the faculty and the administration. Stakeholders have enough reason to blame each other in the absence of transparent mechanism. This paper proposes a transparent point system for both faculty and higher education administration based on three most important categories – Teaching (T), Research (R), and community Service (S). This proposed transparent point system will present solution to resolve confusion among stakeholders. Faculty based on this transparent proposed point system may perform well and administration based on this proposed point system may decide to retain the faculty.

According to Michael O. Samuel and Crispen Chipunza (2013) that competition for top academics across the higher education and research landscape of South Africa has assumed a prominent dimension and this phenomenon has resulted in the ever increasing attrition of this category of employees from one institution to the next. This paper seeks to identify and evaluate factors that facilitate the attrition and retention of senior academic employees in South African universities. The study adopted survey research method using quantitative research design. A self-administered questionnaire was used to gather primary data from respondents. The study examines the influence of certain work attributes on the retention of 255 senior academic staff in 10 universities across South Africa. Results of the study indicates that most of the respondents place greater importance on challenging work, inter-personal relationship, access to research resources and job security. Results are discussed in terms of the implications for retention practices in the universities.
Rana Zeeshan Mubarak, Zaira Wahab and N.R.Khan 2012 describe that in higher education institutions, which are considered as the hub of knowledge, the retention of knowledge-workers commonly called as faculty members has become a crucial issue. Based on the previous evidences this paper aims to investigate the impact of “pay satisfaction” and the “opportunities of learning and growth” on faculty retention in private higher education institutions of Pakistan. The study is quantitative in nature. Primary data was collected through field survey method from 200 fulltime faculty members. Pearson correlation and regression analysis were employed to examine the hypotheses of the study. Findings suggested that both of the independent variables have a significant impact on retention of faculty members whereas in higher education institutions opportunities of learning and growth have a higher impact as compared to pay satisfaction on faculty retention. Study proposed that both retention factors are indispensable and can play a vital role in retaining the faculty members.

Timothy Butler and James Waldroop 2012 in their paper “Job Sculpting; The art of Retaining your Best People” printed in HBR series of books highlighted that only if their jobs fit their deeply embedded life interests – that is, their long-held, emotionally driven passions. They introduced the concept of job sculpting, the art of matching people to jobs that resonate with the activities that make them truly happy. Managers don’t need special training to job sculpt, but they do need to listen more carefully when employees describe what they like and dislike about their jobs. Once managers and employees have discussed deeply embedded life interests – ideally, during employee performance reviews – they can work together to customize future work assignments.

According to Kirti Naik (2011) in his paper Philosophy of Motivation A Strategy to Retain Manpower has focused on the aspect that those organizations, that care for long term relationship with the employees and consider them as partners, in progress will certainly work out ways and means to create a heaven where apart from money the employees get lovable and caring fraternity, time to satisfy their individual needs and aspirations and recognition for performance.
In an article by Arjit Bose (2011), According to him exit interviews are recognized in many companies nowadays and are used as a valuable tool for reducing employee turnover. Employee turnover is a serious concern and through exit interview reasons can be analyzed for why employees leave any organization. These reasons can be further taken care off for increasing retention of employees.

Dr Babita Agarwal, Kshama Ganjiwale (2011) have emphasized Psychological contract as key factor in retention management. Although compensation matters, employees are more concerned with the level of fulfillment they get from their jobs. They also feel that working with an understanding supervisor or manager in a cooperative and trusting work environment is important. Organizations should focus on making sure that people they hire are a good match for the job and the work culture. Career development, employee’s relationship etc are more important than pay.

On the other hand Priyanka Rawal (2011) concludes that despite increased globalization and fluctuating economic times of jobs, most employers are now struggling hard to keep good workers who are expecting more from their management and can willingly shift if their needs are not met. If an organization succeeds in managing its people well, employee retention will take care of itself. She further in her paper introduces that a focus on managing the work environment so as to effectively utilize the available human assets is the need of the hour. Organizations should create an environment that fosters ample growth opportunities, appreciation for work accomplished and a friendly co-operative atmosphere that makes an employee feel connected and retains him in the organization.

Paul Michelman (2011) in his paper Why Retention Should Become a Core Strategy Now, concludes by suggesting the companies to build a culture of retention. For all the myriad approaches companies take to promote loyalty among their employees-broad-based and narrow, short term and long term - the one universal truth is that employees are more likely to stick it out in tough times when they feel that they are treated with integrity. According to him many workers prefer to stay with their current employer if their manager presents them with opportunities to grow, develop their skills, and position
themselves to move forward in their careers. How to provide those opportunities? Learn as much as you can about your employees.

M D Verma & Sujata Nagaraj (2011) have focused on the issue that work life balance is a successful tool for managing & retaining talent; through work – life balance programmes. As WLB contributes towards flexible working arrangements it helps in reducing absenteeism. It reduces stress and builds productivity. There is improved morale, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment. It enhances positive attitude. Coaching and mentoring aid in creating a better retention culture, various stress management techniques can be taught through a well developed training program. These various strategies will help to manage the diverse culture leading to loyalty – commitment and retention. This issue can be focused as a part of retention practices.

Shalu Katyal, Shuchi Goel (2011) in their research paper have proved that effectively implementing employee retention program by increasing employee engagement ensures that the employees are satisfied with their work, take pride in their work, report to duty on time, feel responsible for their job, feel valued for their contributions, and have a high job satisfaction. Understanding trends, and knowing and tailoring corporate job offerings to a changing workforce, puts an organization and its managers in control so that they can find and implement new ways to raise employee engagement levels.

Dr B K Tripathi (2010) in his research concluded that employees perceived that the most important reason they leave is because their work is unappreciated and not recognized. Institution should emphasize on career growth, learning and development along with ongoing career development programmes, up gradation etc. employees also love exciting and challenging work in today’s global environment. To increase job satisfaction among faculty and reduce turnover organizations should consider providing a realistic job preview. A proper retention strategy should be framed. Employees prefer to leave with dissatisfaction with pay – 58%, with management – 48% and promotional opportunities 48% and inadequate career - 44% was concluded in his research.
Nishant Saxena and Monika Kumari (2010) According to them work environment plays pivotal role in inculcating culture of retention. Corporate culture is the focal point that affects employee commitment and engagement in an organization. The values of a corporate culture influence the ethical standards within a corporation as well as managerial behavior. Positive culture helps employees stay with the organization. The paper further suggests that by involving an employee, engaging an employee, it can serve as a great tool to retain talent. Engaged employees stay with the company for a longer period.

As presented by Eklund (2009), obstacles to faculty retention are based on the success of and ensuring a positive workplace climate. The goal is to create a climate rich with positive attitudes, clearly delineated performance expectations and collegial relationships.

Xu (2008) conducted a study on Environmental factors that also affect faculty retention. Institutional culture and conditions such as institutional declination, faculty to student ratio, and departmental size have impact on faculty members. Institutional culture is an important factor because it has a very significant impact on a lot of aspects in the university. Manifestations of the said culture can be seen in numerous activities of an institution including reward system, support for activities, and level of work autonomy. These work-life issues are relevant for faculty members for they serve as basis for the decision to leave a certain institution. Administrative support such as that focused on administrative works and teaching and graduate assistance also plays a role in faculty retention.

Xu (2008) stresses that “Is is clear that voluntary turnover is a responsive decision that an individual faculty member undertakes when s/he perceives the work environment as persistently dissatisfactory with respect to one’s specific personal and professional needs and expectations” (p. 42).
Xu 2008 expressed his view that professional characteristics of faculty members consider when deciding to leave an institution. These include professional training, job experience, years in position, academic rank, tenure status, teaching load, research productivity, and community services.

Previous research has shown a link between faculty salaries and job satisfaction (Smart, 1990; Kerlin & Dunlap, 1993; Boyer et al, 1994; Xu, 2008). Kerlin and Dunlap (1993) found evidence of frustration with resource inequities among faculty in their study, and anecdotal and interview data from their research support the connection between faculty views on salary and morale. But compensation of faculty is not merely measured in dollars and cents. Therefore, assessing the relationship between salary and overall job satisfaction must be expanded beyond monetary reimbursement for work completed. Faculty who make the same amount of money may have varying levels of satisfaction with their compensation, so it is important to understand the relationship between various pay satisfaction measures and overall job satisfaction, including the level and quality of benefits received.

Xu (2008) mentions that, “From the institutional perspective, voluntary turnovers, most likely unwanted losses, are of more concern. In some cases, faculty turnover may bring positive effects in the institution. Having new faculty members could bring in fresh, new ideas and suggestions into the academic world. Also, more often than not, the salary to be given to these new hires is less than that of senior faculty members. However, the downside to losing an old employee has more negative impact on universities. Undesirable consequences may include lost return on previous investment, disruption of research and teaching programs, discontinuity in student mentoring, and the monetary issues related in replacing the faculty members who left the organization.

The research presented by Xu (2008) states that “Productivity is another unique and complicated dimension in faculty work life” (p. 44). When faculty members sense that their influence, be it in the institution itself or on student, are declining, they are more likely to feel the need to leave.
As said by Xu (2008), “Faculty turnover has long been a practical and research concern in higher education due to the costly monetary and academic consequences that the institutions have to bear” (p.40). Having open positions would mean that the institution has to put out money for advertising. Faculty retention is needed to be ensured by management since recruitment is a costly and time consuming process.

Many studies point to the relationship between job security and overall job satisfaction (Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995; Lease, 1999; Rosser, 2004; Xu, 2008). However, job security may be viewed quite differently by tenured faculty than by those on the tenure track or those who have no tenure system available to them. The tenure process lends a level of security to a person’s position that non tenure track faculty-like instructors and academic professionals may not have as part of their employment at an institution. Therefore, faculty at different ranks may assign different levels of importance to job security in relation to their overall job satisfaction.

According to Zhuo & Volkwein; Xu that individual factors in faculty retention is demographics. Gender, race, marital status, and family responsibilities are some of the issues related to faculty turnover (Zhuo & Volkwein, 2004; Xu, 2008). Gender and race discrimination in academic institutions tend to lead towards wanting of female faculties and minority groups in universities to leave. Family responsibilities also play a major role in the retention of faculty members. Those employees with duties to fulfill have a lot to take into consideration. Though studies have disparate findings when looking for a relationship between demographic issues and faculty retention, it is best to still consider these factors so an organization may be able to give equal and fair opportunities for all faculties’ advancement and progress. Another factor to consider is the professional characteristics faculty members consider when deciding to leave an institution. These include professional training, job experience, years in position, academic rank, tenure status, teaching load, research productivity, and community services (Xu, 2008).
Dee2002 explained that since rank is somewhat indicative of years of work as a faculty member due to the tenure process, it is important to account for the number of years a person has been employed at the University. Precedent also exists in the literature on faculty satisfaction for including the number of years employed at the current institution in the research model (Dee, 2002; Xu, 2008). Factors related to overall job satisfaction may change with the years of service to an institution, which may manifest themselves as differences due to rank, since faculty generally move up the ranks the longer they stay at an institution, with the majority of time spent in the rank of professor.

Researchers have explored faculty satisfaction in a number of ways, including change over time (Johnsrud & Heck, 1998), relation to turnover and intention to leave (Ehrenberg et al, 1991; Tamada & Inman, 1997; Dee, 2002; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004), relation to stress factors (Lease, 1999; Smith, Anderson, & Lovrich, 1995), the role of the department chair (Nienhuis, 1994; Miller et al, 2001), gender and minority differences (Tack & Patitu, 1992; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995), and the relationship of discipline-specific factors (Xu, 2008).

Whitfield, 2008 explained that Retention strategies should not be isolated and culture of retention implies the length of holding your employees so far. Every decision has a Ripple Effect and everything we do and think affects the people in our lives and their reactions in turn affect others. The choices one makes have far-reaching consequences. Most organizations have great people working for them – many are in the trenches and are rarely recognized for their efforts. On the other, a positive culture helps employees stay with the organization. The organization must ensure that its working environment and culture meet employee needs. Social support and leadership are part of the culture solutions as well as ensuring that employees can maintain good work life balance. Top talented employees recognize that they represent a valued organizational asset. When their loyalty deteriorates, the tendency to switch organizations increases.

An empirical study revealed that about 80 percent of global business leaders believe the human resource management (HRM) as more important today than they were before, and 68 percent believe retaining talent and reducing turnover are more important than
acquiring new blood (Accenture, 2001). Since the enactment of the Private Universities Act of 1992, Bangladesh has seen a tremendous growth in private educational platforms over the recent years mainly through the emergence of a large number of universities in the private sector (Ashraf et al., 2007).

An organization that makes adequate provision for its employee's personal growth thereby enabling them to move further up in the organizational hierarchy can be rest assured of long term commitment from its employees. V V Ramani and Usha Raghunandan in their article ‘Managing Attrition Level in Organization’ conclude that, an Exit interview conducted with a right attitude towards ascertaining the true cause of an employee’s voluntary exit would definitely help the management in taking corrective measures to avoid such exits in future.

Sharma and Jyoti, 2006 concluded that career planning and development have also been recognized for enhancing job satisfaction of an individual.

Kreitner and Kinicki (2006) identified five predominant causal models: need fulfillment (e.g. salary needs, family needs); discrepancies between what is expected and what actually happens; fulfillment of work values, etc. Knerr concludes that married people generally possess higher job-satisfaction than their single counterparts (Knerr, 2006) because married adults are generally better adjusted than unmarried counterparts. Proper physical environment makes the job comfortable. Poor working conditions like poor building design and maintenance create situations for teachers that affect not only academic outcome but health too. Poor lighting, dirty and in-operational windows and dirty rest rooms are the source of teacher dissatisfaction (Schneider, 2003). Plananandanond, Laksana and Jose (2004) researched that overall working conditions are able to predict the satisfaction/it or fairness of treatment; and dispositional (genetic).

Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as an emotional state related to the positive or negative appraisal of job experiences. Kreitner and Kinicki (2006) identified five predominant causal models: need fulfillment (e.g. salary needs, family needs); discrepancies between what is expected and what actually happens; fulfillment of work...
values, equity or fairness of treatment; and dispositional (genetic) components where certain congenital personality traits lead to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is seen as one of the determinants of organizational commitment. It is thus expected that highly satisfied workers will be more committed to the organization.

Married people generally possess higher job-satisfaction than their single counterparts (Knerr, 2006) because married adults are generally better adjusted than unmarried counterparts. Hence, the next hypothesis is *Journal of Services Research*, Volume 9, Number 2 (October 2009 - March 2010).

A high quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of a successful system. Attracting and retaining high quality teachers is thus a primary requirement for an educational institution (Sharma and Jyoti, 2006). For the development of quality teachers one has to understand factors associated with it. Job satisfaction is one of those important factors. Teachers' job satisfaction is a multifaceted phenomenon (Sharma and Jyoti, 2006, Srivastava, Holani & Bajpai, 2005) that is critical to turnover (Hom & Griffeth, 1995), commitment and school effectiveness most disliked part of faculties when it comes to their responsibilities. These tasks are time consuming and just serve as burden to the faculty.

Barnes et al. (1998) identified similar experiences (or lack thereof) as work-life stressors hypothetically leading to faculty turnover intentions. Those stressors are related to reward satisfaction, institutional/departmental reputation and influence, time commitments and student interactions. Others have identified interactions with students to be among the most rewarding aspects of faculty life (Wiesenbarg and Peterson, 2004; Rosser, 2005).

Rosser, 2005 contributed that the work of faculty has traditionally been described in broad terms of teaching, research and service, the literature is rather sketchy regarding details of that work. Yet, it appears that those day-to-day work-life experiences (e.g. administrative and technical support, opportunities for professional development) are the ones that contribute to faculty satisfaction, ultimately leading to decisions to stay or leave.
Plananandanond, Laksana and Jose (2004) researched that overall working conditions are able to predict the satisfaction.

Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 stressed on the reward and incentive program of compensation, tenure and job security is an important factor in faculty retention. Tenure offers both academic freedom and a sufficient degree of economic security that makes the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Without it, non-tenured faculty are more concerned with job security and become more sensitive to perceived institutional decline. But with the recent financial constraints, many institutions have resorted to hiring more non-tenure track faculty to replace the tenured ones. They are signed to a fixed-term contract which assigns them to take a heavier teaching load at the undergraduate level. While this would save money spent for salaries, it also increases the turnover rate and could possibly disrupt course offering. It is suggested that institutions hiring non-tenured faculty at high proportion should also be prepared for high turnover rates. Institutions that do not have a tenure system are especially vulnerable to high turnover among their professors at higher ranks. It is imperative for academic institutions to provide strong support for faculty and assist in their career development. The package of salaries and benefits are considered as an important reward. The study has also found strong evidence that salaries strongly affect the attitudes of faculty towards their job. The faculty understands salary gains as a symbolic representation of their legitimacy and recognition of their worth to their home institutions. Relative salary and raises to one’s peers are found to affect a faculty member’s attitude and performance, more than just knowing the absolute salary of a faculty member. Institutions should also be more responsive to salary equity issues among women and minorities, along with salary compression, as these could affect their perception about it. Public doctoral and research institutions that average a lower faculty salary from its competitors have a disadvantage in faculty recruitment and retention. Faculty members at private and wealthier institutions, especially the tenured ones, are more likely to report higher levels of satisfaction with compensation and resources. This equates to them having higher intentions of staying. Salaries are found to be higher in each faculty rank in private institutions compared to public ones. Thus, the competitiveness of public institutions has been compromised in the academic labor market.
Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 states that faculty members at different stages of their careers also have different concerns. Non-tenured faculty are more concerned with their job security, autonomy and institutional effectiveness rather than their compensation. Other factors that influence their job satisfaction and intentions to leave are their work assignments, in teaching and service activities. Meanwhile, tenured faculties are more concerned about compensation rather than job security. They care more for external extrinsic rewards to be awarded to them. Thus, there may be a need to accelerate faculty compensation at the point of obtaining the tenure. Institutions should also acknowledge the special burdens of faculty at earlier career stages in order to monitor their development and helping them overcome initial career anxiety. This will help them have a smooth career transition while prospering in their new position. Academic administrators should adopt flexible practices on work assignments so that the early career-stage faculty would be able to accomplish their highest professional priorities. Departmental leaders should be the most flexible in assigning service responsibilities to non-tenured faculty as they may be sensitive with too many service demands and affect their departure intentions. It has been found that seniority, rank, compensation and job security have powerful influences on faculty retention. However, departure decisions are based on a completely different set of individual, professional, organizational, workplace and external variables that contribute to one’s satisfaction and departure decisions. The variables are represented in a framework shown in Figure 2.
Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 expressed his view that Tenure and compensation has also been found as important variables. Faculty members who left their institutions to accept an outside offer were found to have been related to the expected salary gain. The pressure of additional compensation is one of the leading factors for faculty to leave their institutions or the academe altogether.

Relationship between organizational support for innovation and faculty job satisfaction, but the analysis did not find autonomy of work and communication with colleagues to be significant. If support from the university was low, then faculty members’ dissatisfaction was high. In another cross-national study of faculty from 16 different countries, six variables were rated as significant factors for faculty job satisfaction: institutional affiliation, level of job strain, income, cooperative climate, locus of control, and geographic location (VanderPutten & Wimsatt, 1999). VanderPutten and Wimsatt also observed factors that did not predict faculty job satisfaction: instruction as a primary role, courses taught, institutional facilities, and quality of retirement benefits.

Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 identified seven major factors identified in influencing departure decisions of faculty and these are closely related to the immediate work
environment. These are the following: competency of administrators (leadership), research facilities (availability of funds) and opportunities, teaching loads, salary, courses taught, competency of colleagues (reputation of department) and congeniality of colleagues. It has been observed that faculty turnover is higher at institutions facing serious enrollment and financial difficulties and at those whose administrative governance is towards autocratic rather than democratic in nature. The motivation behind faculty intention to leave is also driven by their compatibility between their work ethic and the values the institution upholds. As the gap widens, so does their intention to leave. Both teaching and research productivity have been linked to faculty retention, as teaching responsibilities have been found as negatively related to faculty intentions for departure. Those who valued and engaged in scholarly activities were also most likely to remain in their institutions.

According to Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 that academic discipline influences faculty’s educational backgrounds, world outlooks and work experience. Within their own fields, some unique subject matters could define the dimensions of knowledge, modes of inquiry, significant reference groups, and the rewards the faculty stands to gain within them. While the rates of publication and commitment to teaching versus research vary greatly within fields, it becomes a way of segregating faculty into different sub-academic labor markets. Thus, faculties in emerging fields have more job opportunities both inside and outside the academe. The model of Zhou and Volkwein (2004) extends these studies by suggesting an array of internal and external factors which influence the faculty’s intention to stay or leave their current job. They have included three major clusters of factors: the organizational characteristics, individual characteristics and work experiences. These are hypothesized to influence faculty job satisfaction, subsequently affecting their intention to leave. The organizational variables include institutional control, institutional type, institutional size, wealth and diversity, level of unionization, financial/personnel policies and employee benefits. While most of the other variables were just adapted from the Smart model, financial/personnel policies are added to address the dissatisfaction with organizational policy being related to intentions of leaving. Personal characteristics refer to the gender, ethnicity, educational attainment, age, marriage status and family financial situation. Institutional experiences are those which
include the workload, productivity and rewards such as tenure, academic rank and compensation. The three blocks of factors directly influence one’s job satisfaction and perceptions of organizational environment. Job satisfaction is seen to be multi-dimensional, also considering satisfaction with job security, autonomy, workload, instruction and research resources and compensation. It could also include one’s perceptions of the organizational environment- from how they treat gender and ethnical climate on campus and how institutional decline is handled. Meanwhile, there are five major external factors: the external job market, the extrinsic rewards (salary and benefits, opportunities for advancement), research opportunities, teaching opportunities and other family considerations. The faculty member goes through a process of growth as they enter an institution with their own personal characteristics. As they gain experience in work, they form their level of satisfaction (and dissatisfaction) with their job, subsequently causing their departure intention. This is often influenced by the external factors as they are compared with the benefits of transferring rather than staying.

Faculty perceptions of the nature of their work and work issues should be a matter of importance to leaders and administrators in educational institutions (Johnsrud, 2002; Peterson and Provo, 1998; Peterson and Wiesenberg, 2004). According to Johnsrud (2002), the quality of work life on college and university campuses has declined. Understanding the work of faculty is significant considering that faculty perceptions of their work life have a direct impact on their satisfaction and ultimately on their intentions to stay or leave (Barnes et al., 1998; Rosser, 2005). Given an anticipated retirement bulge, together with increasing college enrolments and fewer doctoral students interested in academic careers (Barnes et al., 1998), faculty retention indeed is a major concern.

Peterson and Wiesenberg (2004) suggested that professional fulfillment and job satisfaction among HRD and AdEd faculty must not be taken for granted, and identified the need to improve organizational climates within the academy. Maintaining the status quo is not an option, particularly given the importance of quality of work life. The results of the current study confirm that call to action: to improve organizational climates.
Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 concluded that faculty turnover may represent potentially serious institutional problems such as faculty dissatisfaction, loss of talent, non-competitive salaries and a negative organizational climate. The costs of turnover are felt in individual, departmental and institutional levels as recruiting for replacements would entail additional effort and resources, course offerings may be disrupted, departmental and student planning may be discontinued, and graduate student advisors would be lost.

When one thinks of a faculty member at a college or university, one may picture a tenured or tenure-track person at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. However, given higher education’s tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service, there are a number of other professionals at colleges and universities that perform job duties related to this mission who could be considered faculty-like, especially those who teach. The National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics includes instructors, lecturers, and others considered faculty by their institution, but with titles other than assistant professor, associate professor, and professor, in their national survey of postsecondary faculty. To fully understand the factors related to the overall job satisfaction of faculty and those who perform faculty like duties at institutions of higher education, one must survey all those who fit the job description, and not just those who are tenured or on the tenure track. Though some studies on faculty job satisfaction have focused on tenured and tenure-track faculty, (Ehrenberg, Kasper, & Rees, 1991; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995; Smith, Anderson, & Lovrich, 1995; Johnsrud & Heck, 1998), others have also included job titles such as instructors, lecturers, and other faculty-like employees of an institution (Kerlin & Dunlap, 1993; Nienhuis, 1994; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004), this study follows the lead of the latter group of researchers as it seeks to uncover the differences in factors related to job satisfaction among different types of faculty-like groups at one research intensive, doctoral degree granting institution in order to present a picture of these differences for the enhanced understanding of administration and faculty alike.
Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 stated a variety of reasons have been found on why faculty have volunteered for termination, including department discord, outside offers, drifting away and other personal reasons. The intent to stay within the organization or exit it is considered as the final stage of the psychological decision-making process of a person. Thus, intent has been regarded as the strongest predictor of actual turnover. The careful consideration of the individual on the benefits and losses of a career move such as this is usually followed.

Zhou & Volkwein, 2004 expressed that the excellence of higher education is a function of the kind of people it is able to enlist and retain on its facilities. While efforts have been made in the search and hiring process of faculty, each departure has represented a poor return on investment. While other faculty may leave their respective institutions, it is only as part of their professional advancement. Their mobility is widely accepted in the field as the loyalty to discipline transcends the loyalty to school as teaching and research skills are readily transferable among schools. Their personal ability and educational attainment is also believed to translate into returns in the marketplace- with greater job opportunities that could also be from outside the academe. This could be triggered by higher income from other jobs or the under-appreciation of research work and publications. Others opt to pursue a different field if tenure is not attained or their research/teaching productivity is sub par. This tenure acts as their form of job security, obtaining academic freedom along the process.

One challenge facing faculty is that the nature of faculty work is changing (Barnes et al., 1998; Johnstone, 1994; Wiesenber and Peterson, 2004). Another is the attempt to derive satisfaction through meaningful work (Chalofsky, 2003; Collins, 2003; Spikes, 1995; Zabreski, 2003), particularly in the face of dramatic change. Indeed, the chaos and change reshaping the nature of work includes ‘demands to “perform more with less”... and lack of balance in people’s work and personal lives’ (Chalofsky, 2003, p. 69 – 70).

Time and again it has been reported that age exercises its influence on the job satisfaction of an individual (Dwivedi, 1977) and has been found to be an important variable in
predicting the job satisfaction of an individual and relationship between them is both complex and fascinating (Rao, 1997). It is further revealed that job satisfaction is high in initial years i.e. 20-25, and above 40 years (Herzberg et. al. 1957; Sharma and Jyoti, 2004).

Berlin & Sechrist, 2002; Pion, Smith & Tyler, 2003 explained that despite the frustrations encountered in their jobs, those who teach, participate in research, and provide service to their communities as higher education faculty find satisfaction with their work. Though there have been recent calls for increased accountability in the higher education sector, such as the Bush Administration’s Spelling’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education, colleges and universities have enjoyed a relatively high level of respect and people continue to seek post high school degrees in large numbers. At the same time, the supply of new faculty is decreasing in areas such as science, math, nursing, and special education. How will the higher education community fill the positions vacated by retiring faculty? The traditional methods of retention and recruitment will be critically important as the shortage of qualified faculty increases in tandem with increased demand. A logical way to retain faculty is to create a satisfactory work environment.

A review of the literature indicates a general satisfaction by faculty with their work lives (Kerlin & Dunlap, 1993; Boyer et al, 1994; Johnsrud & Heck, 1998; Johnsrud, 2002). However, satisfaction with specific areas, such as compensation, can become more or less important to overall job satisfaction due to external pressures on higher education as a whole. Perennial issues of special concern seem to be salary and relations with institutional administration (Kerlin & Dunlap, 1993), and strength of chair and department relations (Johnsrud & Heck, 1998).

Higher education is not immune to the problem of low job satisfaction; in fact, educational leaders have increased the number of research studies that try to identify factors that affect job satisfaction (Davis, 2001; Grace & Khalsa, 2003; Scarpinato,
In addition to educational leaders and community leaders, other offices and stakeholders within higher education have concern about the financial impacts that job satisfaction and faculty departures have on the institution. Recently, an office of equal opportunity within a university developed focus groups to try to address job satisfaction for the recruitment and retention of qualified faculty (North Carolina State, 2001). The focus groups spent time discussing and evaluating the departure of key faculty members. These groups also found ways to retain these faculty members and limit the cost to the university. Research conducted in higher education has tried to identify specific variables and a relationship of these variables to faculty job satisfaction (Dee, 2002; VanderPutten & Wimsatt, 1999). These variables may range from organizational support and personal support to overall compensation packages. Dee examined a cross-section of faculty at an urban community college and found a strong negative.

Grace & Khalsa, 2003 who conducted a faculty survey at a Massachusetts higher education institution identified professional development and salary packages as the most important job satisfaction factors.

Grunwald & Peterson, 2003 states that an extension of the theory introduced the concept of improved communication and trust as being a key to faculty involvement. As administrative leadership focuses on the involvement of faculty and realizing its effects on the culture of the institution, institutional goals are successfully met. This encourages faculty to put greater personal investment in their work, along with increasing organizational commitment, having more creative communication among faculty, and subsequently, better teaching and learning. The adaptation or involvement in an innovation is also driven by the evidence they receive as to how it has an advantage over the current system, its compatibility with existing values, the effort needed to implement (easy rather than complex), and its ability to be experimented with and observed on possible impact.

According to DeVaney and Chen (2003), demographic variables such as age, gender, race, and education have an effect on job satisfaction. It has been shown, for instance, that older workers are more likely to be satisfied than younger workers.
Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002, p. 518 “Faculty members are rarely satisfied with their own institutions. They see administrators as incompetent, communication as poor, and their influence as declining. This discontent with their institutions is in stark contrast to their satisfaction with their intellectual lives, the courses they teach, and their collegial relationships.” (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002, p. 518).

As Johnsrud (2002) points out, institutions of higher education have not traditionally concerned themselves with human resource issues. The studies highlighted above have delved into the topic of faculty job satisfaction, and some included instructors in their general conclusions about faculty, but none paid particular attention to the differences among the ranks of both faculty and faculty-like professionals employed in higher education. This study seeks to understand how these groups differ. This understanding may help higher education administrators better work with the people who are teaching, researching, and providing service at their institution and understand what it is that makes them want to return day after day as a faculty member, instructor, or other academic professional. Awareness of different factors related to satisfaction for different ranks of faculty may assist administration in targeting professional development opportunities to those who would most benefit from them. Understanding what factors lead to satisfaction among faculty-like employees, such as instructors and other academic professionals may help University administration further understand what draws people to these jobs rather than tenure-track positions or careers outside of academe, which may lead to improved recruitment and retention of these individuals.

Yousef, 2002 suggested that lack of career development is reported to be directly and negatively related to job satisfaction. As Provencal (2002) notes, “The leading assumption that lies behind proposing salary-based solutions to the problems of recruitment and retention is that since the problems are market-driven, they are also salary-based.”

Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002 expressed his view that the empowerment of the faculty to contribute to his or her profession and allowing the faculty to solve problems greatly
contributes to improving his or her retention in the field of higher education instruction. This could be beneficial as effectiveness could be increased when faculty members feel competent and that their importance is recognized.

Dee, 2002 explained the University Characteristics which support for innovation, such as new ideas and processes, can be related to overall satisfaction with an organization, with higher levels of support for this factor leading to higher levels of job satisfaction.

According to Johnsrud & Rosser (2002), “Faculty members are dedicated to their work and they love what they do, but they often wonder if they would not be happier doing it somewhere else” (p. 518). There is no guarantee that once a faculty is hired, he or she will stay in the organization. This being said, administrator of institutions should make an effort in striving to satisfy the personal and environmental needs of faculty members for the assurance of their retention. A clearer understanding of what motivates faculty in leaving an academic institution would be beneficial for it would allow prevention of the said event.

Johnsrud & Rosser (2002) has the same insight in saying that “Individuals leaving and staying differed most sharply according to their perceptions of quality of life, time pressure, and chair/department relations” (p. 521).

Ingersoll, 2001 in his study of job satisfaction among Management Teachers of MBA Colleges is important because there are aspects of the job that are highly attractive and lead to satisfaction and aspects of the job that lead to dissatisfaction. Positive aspects include the opportunity to work with a school faculty and staff to accomplish common goals, developing school culture and the ability to work with students. Too often in studies of Management Teachers the study looks at negative aspects of the lectureship and neglects looking at what reasons make the job of running a Management College attractive, leading to job satisfaction. Understanding why teachers leave is the first step in getting them to stay.
Work related variables such as whether the job is interesting, good relations with management, job security (permanent or contract jobs), higher pay, a sense of control over one’s work were identified as important factors underlying job satisfaction (Miller, 1980; Souza-Poza, 2000).

Hom & Kinicki (2001) generalized a leading portrayal of how job satisfaction progresses into turnover. Job satisfaction is probably the most frequently investigated predicator of turnover (e.g. Hom and Kinicki, 2001) with an average correlation between satisfaction and actual turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000).

According to a study released by Accenture (2001), 80 percent of global business leaders believe that 'people issue' are more important today than they were three years ago, and 68 percent believe that retaining talent is more important than acquiring 'new blood'. That recognition and the extraordinary efforts. Some companies are making to attract and retain top talent represent fundamental shifts in employer - employee relationship. Essentially more organizations are now realizing that retention is a strategic issue and represents a competitive advantage.

As per view of Wagner (1987) there is positive correlation between age and job involvement. He also found the existence of curvilinear relationship between organizational tenure and job involvement, with involvement increasing progressively with increased tenure until mid-career and then tapering off with long tenure. Quit intentions among beginning employees are generally high especially during their initial period of employment (Griffeth and Hom, 2001).

The research done by Miller, Jackson, & Pope (2001), they state that “On campus faculty development was identified as the predominant form of retention activity, and mentoring by other faculty members was identified as the most effective form of retention” (p. 3). The department chair has the ability to make the above mentioned activities successful as they play an important role in the educational institutions. They are involved in the important decision-making processes in academic institutions. However, this job can sometimes be difficult for the needs and expectations of the
faculties may constantly differ as we are in a complex and changing environment. Also, inadequacy and lack of communication by these administrators can be detrimental to the goal of making faculty members stay.

As the retention of talent with critical skill sets is acknowledged by organizations as vital for achievement of business growth and the building of organizational competencies, some organizations strive to be the 'employer of choice' by creating a positive environment and offering challenging assignments that, foster continued personal growth. An 'employer of choice' (Eoc) is an organization that outperforms its competition in the attraction development and retention of people with business, required aptitude, often through innovative and compelling human resources programs (Clarke 2001; Dessler 1999)

Lee,2001 states that Organizational theorist have reported that how much employees feel supported by their organization can have a direct impact on perceived satisfaction and job performance.

Another concept that has gained interest as a construct relevant for understanding and managing contemporary employment relationships is the psychological contract, which refers to employees’ subjective interpretations and evaluations of their deal with the organization (Rousseau, 1996; 2001; Turnley & Feldman, 1998). Researchers in this field argue that in order for retention management to be effective, the creation of an optimal portfolio of HR practices is not sufficient and that it is important to manage employees’ expectations relating to these practices. Only in this way HR managers can be confident to create a deal that is mutually understood by both the organization and its employees (Rousseau, 1996)

According to Clarke, 2001; Levine, 1995 Effective communication strengthens employee identification with the company and builds trust. Employee tends to remain with the organization when they feel their capabilities, efforts, and performance contributions are recognized and appreciated (Davies 2001).

Heery Edmund & Noon Mike, 2001 expressed his view that People are a key component off any company’s ability to execute its strategies and achieve its goals.
Retention is the ability to hold on to employees where an organization finds that it is losing valuable staff (such as those with scarce skill or specialist knowledge) it may be said to have retention problem.

Miller, Jackson, & Pope (2001) states that “Further, the need for a strong, well-trained faculty base, looming faculty shortages, and heightened competition for an educated workforce have precipitated a more comprehensive and strategic understanding of community college recruitment and retention” (p. 10) Role expectations should be clearly defined from the very beginning of recruiting an individual so that he or she in any particular time would not feel any form of unease towards the job (Miller, Jackson, & Pope, 2001). The department chair must make sure that expectations of both the Institution and the individual to be hired are aligned before any decisions are made. Upon hiring, progress in the faculty development should be constantly monitored as this would bring a sense of accomplishment for the teachers (Miller, Jackson, & Pope, 2001).

Davies 2001 states that Employee tends to remain with the organization when they feel their capabilities, efforts, and performance contributions are recognized and appreciated.

According to Ingersoll (2001), teachers leave when they encounter environments that lack essential professional supports that include: (1) support from school leadership; (2) organizational structures and workforce conditions that convey respect and value for them; and (3) Induction and mentoring programs for new and experienced teachers.

Each and every dynamics venture continuously, therefore strives to reduce the turnover of the best talented employees for its organization (Porter, 2001). Following this fact, strategic staffing has become a vital issue, because the ability to cling on highly talented core employees can be crucial to future survival of the business (Ettorre, 1997). In any event, the loss of core human capital is enormously costly, which accrues in numerous ways such as bidding up of market salaries for experienced hires to replace them, the costs of recruiting and assimilating new talents, the lost-investment in talent development and the hidden costs of lost-productivity, lost-sales opportunities and strained customers relationships (Eskildesen and Nussler, 2000).
Oshagbemi's (2000) finding confirms the almost obvious statement that research satisfaction is related to rank - the higher the rank, the greater the level of satisfaction of academicians.

(Oshagbemi's, 2000) states that Level of occupation i.e., designation does affect the degree of job satisfaction enjoyed by the academicians. Professors are enjoying higher level of job satisfaction than the lecturers and readers but step is not completely straight as readers are less satisfied than lecturers.

Salopek (2000, p.20) views the following critical elements to be important if any organization has to affect a good employee retention exercise:

- Communicating how each employee contributes to the corporate vision and mission;
- Developing a climate of trust;
- Improving the skills level of the managers who supervise professional staff;
- Providing management training, including effective leadership skills by emphasising development;
- Clarifying the understanding of employees' needs and reinforcement of frequent communication;
- Not burning workers out;
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities to accelerate learning contribution;
- Investing in maintaining ongoing commitment by paying the best talent what they are worth.

Salopek (2000) and the IRS Report (2000) state that retention leaders need to do the following in order to avoid brain drain (in no order of priority):

- Managing people and not retention;
- Having a culture of caring, balanced with a tradition of excellence;
- Never soliciting employee feedback and then ignoring it;
- Keeping an eye on the high performers and rewarding outstanding performance;
- Viewing people management as a strategic management issue;
- Being relentless in pursuit of continuous improvement.
Eskidsen and Nussler (2000) suggest that employers are fighting to get talented employees in order to maintain a prosperous business.

Core business units and the respective competencies obviously vary from one institution to the next, depending on, among other things, competitive strategies and differentiation. All higher education institutions require clear objectives in line with their mandate and core faculties that address their target markets, be it community development or skills development (Tach & Murphy, 1995). All institutions should therefore address the core competencies and human characteristics that are required for successful careers, responsible citizenship and a good life (Chickering & Stewart, 1995).

Eskildesen 2000, Nussler 2000 contributed that employer have a need to keep employees from leaving and going to work for other companies. This is true because of the great costs associated with hiring and retaining new employees. The best way to retain employees is by providing them with job satisfaction and opportunities for advancement in their careers. The saying, good help is hard to find, is even truer these days than ever before because the job market is becoming increasingly tight.

Guibitosi (1996) agrees with Tippeconnic III and Swisher (2000) as he proposes that academic departments can support building community by: (1) Structuring faculty meetings so that there are opportunities for small group interactions; (2) developing departmental faculty forums where presenters are required to conduct and present their research in teams; (3) Offering benefits to team presenters such as travel money; and (4) Coordinating team teaching opportunities.

University support and employment options are variables that faculty members rate as highly valuable in consideration of job satisfaction factors in faculty positions at an institution. Another important variable within faculty job satisfaction is the role of department chairs (i.e., supervision) (Miller et al., 2001; Nienhuis, 1994).

Dibble, 1999 indicates that Institutional policies and human resource practices such as performance management systems are again linked to line management functions. If badly and subjectively managed, they can negatively affect employee morale.
are motivated to put more effort into their work when activities follow rewards, but basing remuneration increases on performance ratings that are often subjective can demotivate employees.

A review by Dibble (1999) suggests that retention starts long before an employee is recruited, that is, when describing the position intended to be filled. Job descriptions, recruitment, selection and orientation are the imperatives of retention. Why does retention commence before the actual employment is effected? If the job descriptions do not define what institutions are looking for, then recruits will not meet the requirements and, as such, will not stay. Certain considerations, such as employee potential for training and development, should, however, be taken into consideration. Central to institutional requirements is their direction embedded in their vision and mission. Departments within the institutions, through human resources, translate these into recruitment, training and development policies (Smit, 1997, p.19). A human resources management strategy therefore emanates from and is based directly on the corporate strategy. Competent human resources management planning that integrates policies, practices and procedures to achieve the right numbers of people in the right jobs at the right time is required (Horwitz, 1991, p.116).

According to the American Management Association, the biggest cost on turnover is that of replacing an employee who leaves. This cost is calculated conservatively at 30% of an employee’s annual salary and for those employees whose skills are in high demand; the cost can rise to two-thirds of their annual salary (Dibble, 1999). However, other studies have found the replacement costs of lost talent to be between 70% and 200% of the lost employee’s annual salary (Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 1999, p.29). Increasing aggressive recruitment and global demands have made retaining the scarce skills more difficult. The main shortcoming is not only losing key members, but the lost productivity and replacement cost. Very few institutions can afford to employ, train and allow their most valued and talented employees to leave, when it is difficult to find better replacements.
Ingersoll (1999) analyzed the effects of school and organizational characteristics of teacher turnover and school staffing problems and found that inadequate administrative support, low salaries, students discipline problems, and limited faculty input into school decision-making all contributed to higher rates of teacher turnover.

Dibble, 1999, p.157 expressed that flexible working hours, a challenging job, a sense of purpose and minimal grievances between staff and employees provide a favorable work environment. In line with remarks by Dibble (1999), respondents also believed that an institution should help employees maintain a balance between personal and work life. In some institutions, practices such as making childcare facilities available on the premises and flextime can make the difference between keeping and losing an employee. “...flexible work practices will never happen in this place ...”; “… if I want to go to other libraries, I don’t need to fill in a request form for such a small trip ...”. The psychological environment, which provides support for handling stress, and physical support infrastructures such as a psychologist or a nurse, etc. on site provide a sense of security to employees. Often statements about the environment, caring attitude towards workers, etc. appear in the official statements of the organizations, but are not often practiced in most work environments.

Tsui & Cheng, 1999 states that teacher is the central element in educational system holding various important responsibilities. The overall performance of universities depends upon their teachers and ultimately their level of commitment and job satisfaction. Thus understanding their behaviors and attitudes needs more attention in organizations.

There is evidence that male and female faculty react differently to stress and strain on the job (Lease, 1999) and have different considerations related to job satisfaction (Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995). Olsen, Maple and Stage also indicated a confound between both female and minority status and academic rank, as a smaller percentage of women and minorities have obtained the rank of professor. Gender, therefore, may have an impact on
the results of a study of faculty satisfaction, particularly since some disciplines remain dominated by male faculty.

Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 1999, p.29 expressed his view that losing employees is a very costly exercise, the replacement costs incurred include advertising and recruitment expenses, orientation and training of new employees, decreased productivity until the new employee is up to speed and loss of customers who were loyal to the departing employee. Finding, recruiting and training the best employees represent major investment challenges. Once a company has captured talented people, the return on investment requires closing the back door to prevent them from walking out. The key role of human resources development professionals should be to lead the war for talent on behalf of their organizations.

Kalivoda, Sorrell, & Simpson, 1994, suggested that as a knowledge-based economy becomes more generally recognized as reliant on effective higher education, public interest in this area has reemerged. "Faculty vitality is a critical ingredient in sustaining the vitality of higher education institutions". More researchers are turning to this issue as one that clearly underpins the success of higher education (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999).

Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998 in his research about faculty satisfaction and retention has tended to focus on salary satisfaction, teaching load and research commitments, and ability to balance family and work-flexible "tenure clocks .

Robbins, 1998, suggested that supportive work environments that do not pose perceived danger such as fire, and accidents, are more preferred by employees. Provision of adequate and appropriate working equipment and clean facilities are related to high job satisfaction . From literature the parameters that generally influence job satisfaction include age, income, conditions of service, working environment, gender, treatment by management, promotion, realization of expectation, company support and attitude.
Johnsrud and Heck (1998) discuss the fact that faculty have the most confidence in the administrators in closest relation to them. With the department chair being the closest administrator to faculty, it is particularly important to assess the relationship his or her support has with the overall job satisfaction of faculty.

Boe and Bobbit (1997) discussed that although teacher turnover is a problem for administrators and policymakers in staffing the nation's classrooms, some teaching turnover is acceptable or even personally desirable (e.g., moving to a new school or to a leadership position) and some is inevitable. Also, the authors felt that a total departure from teaching is the most troublesome component because it represents a reduction in the teaching force, thus, requiring a compensating in-flow of replacement teachers.

Perie and Baker (1997) in a study conducted on job satisfaction among more than 36,000 elementary and secondary public school teachers reported that female teachers reported higher levels of job satisfaction showed weak correlations with salary and benefits. It has been consistently established that job satisfaction varies with age for men as well as women in various occupations. Similar to professionals in other occupations, job satisfaction in teachers has been related to demographic variables including age, education, marital status and gender.

Prior research suggests that internal stressors on faculty include achievement and recognition for achievement, autonomy, growth and development, the quality of students, the reputation of the institution and one’s colleagues, responsibility, the interaction between students and teachers and its effect on students’ learning, and the work itself. Factors that prevent job dissatisfaction describe relationships to the context or environment in which individuals work, representing such variables as interpersonal relationships, salary, tenure, policies and administration, rank, supervision, working conditions, the fit between the faculty role and the person involved, and collective bargaining.

“Work determines a person’s worth and place in society and it influences one’s psychological identity and sense of well being. Work establishes one in the community of human kind. It links a person to others, advances the goals of culture, and gives purpose
Faculty members’ satisfactions, and implicitly, their decisions to stay or leave, are influenced by a variety of factors. These factors may be categorized into four general domains: individual circumstances and background, departmental factors, factors at the college and university level, and factors relating to the community in which the university is located (Fairweather, 1996; Clark and Lewis, 1985).

Fairweather, 1996 suggested that Faculty satisfaction is often unknown until a professor chooses to leave a position in search of a better setting for his or her professional work and personal situation. Evidence from national surveys suggests, however, that faculty satisfaction is heavily influenced by certain aspects of working conditions and rewards. According to Tach & Murphy, 1995 and Chickering & Stewart, 1995 that all higher education institutions require clear objectives in line with their mandate and core faculties that address their target markets, be it community development or skills development. All institutions should therefore address the core competencies and human characteristics that are required for successful careers, responsible citizenship and a good life.

Zobbit et al, 1994 discussed a variety of extrinsic factors have been associated with teacher satisfaction, including salary, perceived support from administrators, school safety, and availability of school resources, among others. These and other characteristics of a teacher’s work environment have been targeted by public commissions, researchers, and educators who claim that "poor working conditions have demoralized the teaching profession. These groups (i.e., public commissions, researchers, and educators) believe that when teachers perceive a lack of support for their work, they are not motivated to do their best in the classroom, and when teachers are not satisfied with their working conditions, they are more likely to change schools or to leave the profession altogether (Choy et al, 1993). However, while intrinsic forces may motivate
people to become teachers, extrinsic conditions can influence their job satisfaction and their desire to remain in teaching throughout their career.

**Hagedorn (1994)** examined the satisfaction of academic staff as a result of a number of variables including salary, perceived support of colleagues, satisfaction with the administration, enjoyment of student interaction, and perceived levels of stress. The results indicate that satisfaction with the salary; total number of working hours, and the perceived support of colleagues directly influenced the level of stress, which in turn, affects the feeling of satisfaction. It means that higher the feeling of stress/fatigue lower will be satisfaction. It means that higher the feeling of stress/fatigue lower will be satisfaction.

**Abraham (1994)** found that instructors with high and medium levels of job satisfaction were more effective than those with low job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was independent of length of service and related solely to an individual’s attitude towards his or her job. Additionally, satisfied faculty perceived their roles as more instrumental in helping students expand their educational goals. Faculty role satisfaction is an important dynamic at higher education institutions. Satisfied faculty members provide a source of strength and identity to the college atmosphere.

**Kalivoda, Sorrell, & Simpson, 1994**, refers to a faculty member who is “unremittingly curious, who feels a sincere commitment to both individual and institutional goals, which derives satisfaction from professional endeavors, which manifests behaviors that reflect enthusiasm for intellectual activity, and who looks forward to what the future may bring.” In essence, a vital professor was defined as a star performer” (Baldwin, 1990, p.26)

**Lillydahl and Singell, 1993** concluded that the compensation the faculty receives is a key determinant of their job satisfaction and the retention of high quality faculty. Therefore the managers of universities are concerned with the competitiveness of their compensation packages both in term of other education institutions and the alternative employment in the industry. Moreover the natural attrition in faculty due to retirement,
competition from the local industry, explosive growth in the number of higher education’s in Africa, drastically increased student enrollment, and the brain drain from Africa to developed countries brings faculty recruitment and retention in developing countries to the forefront of management priorities (Amey, 1993).

According to Billingsley (1993), many retention decisions to retire, stay at home with children, or change careers often occur due to changing needs, priorities, and interests, rather than problems in the workplace. For example, providing additional administrative support, creating reasonable role expectations, and decreasing stress in the workplace does reduce attrition and increase teacher effectiveness.

Furnham (1992) categorizes factors that can have an influence on job satisfaction into three groups namely: i. Organizational policies and procedures that have to do with the nature of the remuneration package, supervision and decision-making practices, and the perception of the quality of supervision. ii. Aspects of the total workload, the variety of skills applied, autonomy, feedback and the physical nature of the working environment. iii. Personal aspects such as self.

Billingsley and Cross (1992) discussed that professional commitment and job satisfaction are important factors for the study of retaining teachers in the workplace and building a strong teaching force.

A recent report on job satisfaction among American teachers identified that more administrative support and leadership, good student behavior, a positive school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy as working conditions associated with higher job satisfaction. A weak relationship was found between faculty satisfaction and salary and benefits. Research also shows that demographic variable such as age and gender have little or no significant impact on job satisfaction (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).
Prior research suggests that internal stressors on faculty include achievement and recognition for achievement, autonomy, growth and development, the quality of students, the reputation of the institution and one’s colleagues, responsibility, the interaction between students and teachers and its effect on students’ learning, and the work itself. Factors that prevent job dissatisfaction describe relationships to the context or environment in which individuals work, representing such variables as interpersonal relationships, salary, tenure, policies and administration, rank, supervision, working conditions, the fit between the faculty role and the person involved, and collective bargaining. (Tack & Patitu, 1992).

According to Boe and Gilford, 1992 Researchers, policymakers, and education leaders agree that teacher satisfaction is a vital factor that affects student achievement. Teachers' job satisfaction is one of the key factors in institutional dynamics and is generally considered to be primary dependent variable in terms of which effectiveness of an organization’s human resource is evaluated. Thus, the understanding of factors affecting teachers' satisfaction at the workplace is of paramount importance for a successful educational system. Advocates of professional autonomy claim that conferring professional autonomy will enhance the attractiveness of the [teaching] profession as a career choice and will improve the quality of classroom teaching and practice.

Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991, carried out this study to investigate and examine that faculties have only a finite amount of time available to them to perform their three primary professional responsibilities: teaching, research, and service. Given increasing expectations for faculty to publish at many colleges and universities, while maintaining their traditional teaching loads, it is reasonable to expect that the degree of faculty commitment to academic advisement will be severely compromised by institutional reward systems that place greater value on competing professional priorities.

According to Hensel 1991 the well being of the university depends on its ability to recruit and retain a talented professorate. Our national well being depends on our ability to develop a happy, emotionally healthy, and productive next generation “ .
Smart (1990) created a casual model to investigate faculty turnover comprised of four sets of variables: individual and institutional characteristics, faculty job satisfaction, work environment measures, and intent to leave the current institution. He found that regardless of tenure status, faculty who were most likely to plan to leave the employing institution were those who were younger, were employed at institutions that had experienced decline or were characterized as having autocratic forms of governance, as well as those faculty who had lower levels of career satisfaction. Among tenured faculty, being male, spending more time on research, and having a strong record of scholarly productivity all influenced faculty to leave the employing institution.

Matier (1990) suggests that one tangible factor, among several intangible factors, were cited in faculty members' decision to leave when they have firm offers in hand is salary. Matier contends, however, that faculty members do not leave positions with which they are entirely satisfied because of the "pull" of an offer; rather it is more likely that there is something about their work life (e.g., research and equipment support, postdoctoral fellows and research assistants, clerical support) or satisfaction (e.g., salary and benefits, lower teaching loads) that predisposes them to accept an offer from elsewhere.

Baldwin, 1990 expressed that faculty engagement refers to faculty member’s perceived sense of connection to the institution at which they work and to the work they do. This connection is illustrated by faculty involvement in their departments and outside of their departments, including involvement with students and colleagues, both academic and non-academic. Faculty publications and research and presentations at national and international conferences are also indicators of faculty engagement.

Matier (1990) identified 33 separate items which influence faculty member’s decisions to stay in their present positions. These items were then grouped into three categories: tangible benefits (cash salary, teaching, research load, etc.), intangible benefits (reputation of institution and department, etc.), and nonworking related benefits (climate, proximity to family and friends, etc). Matier’s tangible benefits are similar to Herzberg’s dissatisfier’s and his intangible benefits correspond to Herzberg’s satisfiers.
Ehrenberg et al., 1990 concluded that compensation packages are also a variable that may affect faculty job satisfaction and thus affect intentions of departure, as well as be a significant factor in retention rates. When compensation levels are higher, job satisfaction and retention rates for assistant and associate professors are also higher, and the magnitude of this effect grows larger as one move from institutions with graduate programs to four-year undergraduate institutions to two-year institutions.

Robbins 1990 examined that employees prefer work situations that allow them to use all their skills, mentally and physically, freedom and quick feedback on their work performance though it has been noted that excessive challenge to one’s abilities may bring in frustrations. Workers prefer jobs that reward them on the basis of what they perceive as economically justifiable (Robbins, 1991). It is not the amount of money one receives but it’s the job-wage congruence based on worker perception that leads to job satisfaction.

Couger, 1989 Studies on IT professionals employees turnover intention is mainly influenced by (1) work itself, (2) opportunity for achievement, (3) opportunity for advancement, (4) pay and benefits, (5) recognition, (6) increased responsibility, (7) technical supervision, (8) interpersonal relations, (9) job security, (10) work conditions and (11) company policies. Apprehensions about job scope, role stress, group cohesion, procedural justice, employment security, training and job investments and the organizational level of human resource practices, such as organizational rewards, employee participation in decision making, training and career development opportunities, induce intentions to quit. Unexpected events, such as alternative job offers, job transfers, acquisition/merger of a company, and changes in marital status or spouse’s work may induce individuals to resign.

As per view of Wagner (1987) there is positive correlation between age and job involvement. He also found the existence of curvilinear relationship between organizational tenure and job involvement, with involvement increasing progressively with increased tenure until mid-career and then tapering off with long tenure. Quit
intentions among beginning employees are generally high especially during their initial period of employment (Griffeth and Hom, 2001).

Mendal, 1987 in his research indicated that low levels of satisfaction and morale can lead to decreased teacher productivity and burnout, which is associated with a loss of concern for and detachment from the people one works with, decreased quality of teaching, depression, greater use of sick leave, efforts to leave the profession, and a cynical and dehumanized perception of students.

Weiler explained that in academic organizations, the role of salary in decisions to leave an institution is most often investigated as the primary reason faculty members leave their institution. The empirical findings regarding the impact of faculty salaries have varied. For example, Weiler (1985) reported that salary was a significant factor in leaving; however, two thirds of those who leave cite personal factors such as relationships with colleagues or a career change followed by availability of research funds and support.

Following the Smith and Milstein (1984) study, Marlow, Inman, and examined the reasons for teachers leaving the field. The researchers analyzed results of 212 randomly selected K-12 teachers from Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming who completed an attitude survey on job satisfaction and perceptions of the workplace. Smith et al., found that 44 % of teachers surveyed considered leaving the teaching profession for the following reasons: (1) lack of fulfillment; (2) boredom with the daily routine; (3) stress; (4) frustration; (5) difficult working conditions; (6) low salaries; (7) student discipline; (8) student’s lack of motivation; (9) poor attitudes; and (10) lack of respect from community, parents, administration, and/or students.

Anand (1982) conducted a study on faculty members and showed that women faculties are more satisfied by designations, better salaries and promotions, but academic careers and attainment were not related with job satisfaction.

Parelius (1982) revealed majority of teachers were displeased with a large number of poorly prepared and unmotivated students.
Lewis (1982) found that teachers who had continuous experience in the current school were more satisfied than others. Job experience is related to JS in a rather interesting fashion as one might expect new employees to be relatively more satisfied with their jobs but this honeymoon terminates after a period of time unless the worker feels that he is making steady progress towards the satisfaction of his occupational and social needs.

Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) expressed that Faculty are the heart of the student experience in higher education, and satisfied faculty are more likely to contribute actively to teaching and research, thereby providing students with a positive educational experience. Colleges and universities must be willing to experiment, invest resources, accept criticism, and risk failure in order to stimulate genuine professional development.

Neumann, 1978 given the concept of job satisfaction and its causes and effects have been studied over a great variety of industrial settings, few studies have dealt with institutions of higher education. However, during the past few years, additional studies have been undertaken concerning job satisfaction within these institutions. Fundamental to any study of this type, is the attitude of educators at this level, as faculty members may not tend to consider themselves as workers, and from this, the literature of business and Industry, their models, or the theories used in describing general industrial activities, is mostly considered not applicable by such institutions and their faculty as a whole. Another reason may be one of quantifying the results, as only the number of scholarly publications produced by faculty members and the number of hours per week spent in teaching can be counted, but the quality of educational output and the value of the resulting production is difficult to ascertain and almost impossible to attribute to any other type of industrial organizational International Business Research April, 2009 87 environment (Cohen, 1974). Still, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in institutions of higher education and the problems of imprecise dependent variables ought not to be overlooked by researchers.

Smith 1978 has been cited quite often by teachers that working with children were a source of satisfaction with their jobs.
Mobley (1977) argued that job dissatisfaction is translated into thoughts of quitting, evaluation of alternatives, and ultimately turnover because quitting is expected to result in more satisfying job.

Wood, 1976 indicates that job satisfaction is a prerequisite to an educator's long tenure and performance, and overall institutional effectiveness. For these reasons it seems wise to identify factors that affect job satisfaction positively use these results as part of an ongoing management program.

Ahuja (1976) reported that dissatisfaction increases when one has to work under an incapable, inefficient and indifferent head or boss.

Cohen, 1974 tried to understand employee morale and to establish relationships between job satisfaction and productivity, absenteeism, and other independent variables.

According to Nicholson and Miljus 1972, Good administrators apparently realize that a high rate of turnover of faculty members results in a faculty of limited commitment, ineffective curriculum development, and general faculty unrest, and it can be costly both to the reputation of the institution and to the well-being of the students.

Lawler (1971) suggested that pay satisfaction is a function of two perceptions (1) the amount of pay he feels that he should receive and (2) the amount of pay he receives. Although the root desire for pay as such is individual's desire to satisfy his physical needs yet it can mean more than this. Pay is arguably one of the most critical aspects of Job Satisfaction. The problem of employee attrition, the industry is facing, is mainly due to pay dissatisfaction. Actual pay and employee's attitude towards it is subject of much research.

Olden and Bradburn 1968 throw a light that generally married adults are better adjusted than unmarried counterparts.

Brown's (1967) study of supply and demand factors in the academic labor market involved almost 10,000 faculties, characterized them in terms of being mobile, and linked this mobility to professional advancement. Brown's study resulted in the identification of seven major factors influencing the decisions of faculty to depart: (1) competency of
administrators; (2) research facilities and opportunities; (3) teaching loads; (4) salary; (5) courses taught; (6) competency of colleagues; and (7) congeniality of colleagues.

Herzberg (1959) theorized that motivators (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement) increase satisfaction, while hygiene's (the lack of motivators) decrease job satisfaction. Faculty satisfaction refers to job satisfaction perceived by faculty in this investigation.

Herzberg et. al. (1959) found positive events dominated by reference to intrinsic aspect of job itself while negative events dominated to extrinsic aspect of Job Satisfaction. The nature of work done is very important element of Job Satisfaction. In fact, it can probably be said that it is the major determiner of JS.

Herzberg theory (1959) emphasized job characteristics rather than individual differences. It suggested that jobs with opportunities for growth, achievement, recognition and advancement enhance motivation and JS.

Caplow and McGee (1958) argue that job satisfaction is critical issues in faculty retention. They contend that the push of academic migration is stronger than the pull of new institution.

According to Herzberg et.al. 1957 one may expect married teachers feeling more satisfied with their jobs. Job characteristics and promotion and recognition are the intrinsic elements, hence they account for maximum variation in job satisfaction based on this transparent culture performs well and retain in the Institution.
SUMMARY

The concept of improved communication and trust as being a key to faculty involvement. Institute should focus on making sure that people they hire are a good match for the job and the work culture. Career development, employee's relationship etc. are more important than pay to retain quality faculties. Losing an old employee has more negative impact on universities. Undesirable consequences disruption of research and teaching programs, discontinuity in student mentoring, the monetary issues related, Inadequate administrative support, low salaries, students discipline problems, and limited faculty input into institution decision-making all contributed to higher rates of Faculty turnover. Professional development and salary packages as the most important job satisfaction factors to retain faculty members. Faculties tend to remain with the organization when they feel their capabilities, efforts, and performance contributions are recognized and appreciated. Faculties who had continuous experience in the current institution were more satisfied than others. Retaining talent is more important than acquiring 'new blood'. Essentially more institution is now realizing that retention is a strategic issue and represents a competitive advantage. Greater importance on challenging work, interpersonal relationship, access to research resources and job security for retention practices in the universities. Faculty turnover may represent potentially serious institutional problems such as faculty dissatisfaction, loss of talent, non-competitive salaries and a negative organizational climate. The costs of turnover are felt in individual, departmental and institutional levels as recruiting for replacements would entail additional effort and resources, course offerings may be disrupted, departmental and student planning. Losing faculties is a very costly exercise; the replacement costs incurred include advertising and recruitment expenses, faculty development, decreased productivity until the new faculties is up to speed. University support and employment options are variables that faculty members rate as highly valuable in consideration of job satisfaction factors in faculty positions at an institution. The groups experiencing democratic leadership to be more satisfied than those experiencing autocratic leadership. It has been experienced that challenging jobs create an environment of satisfaction. High strained activity for faculty result in ill health (emotional exhaustion, psychomatic health problems) and active involvement and choice of work give rise to positive outcomes like job challenge and job
satisfaction. Demographic characteristics like age, gender and designation play important role in retention.

After reviewing the studies, it is evident that there are very few studies in the area of faculty retention in the management Institution and specifically in Indian context. There is a need to conduct research in this area.