

EXPLORING THE FACTORS LEADING TOWARDS TALENT MANAGEMENT OF TEACHERS IN STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KARNATAKA

Mrs. Preethi Keerthi DSouza *

Dr. P. Pakkeerappa**.

Ms. P.V Sumitha***.

**Assistant Professor, Department of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Commerce, Mangalore University, E-mail ID : preethi_ds@rediffmail.com*

***Professor, Department of Business Administration, Mangalore University, Mangalagangothri, Mangalore-574199, E-mail: ppkmba@yahoo.co.in*

****Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, AIMIT, St.Aloysius College, Mangalore 575022, E-mail: sumitha@staloyisius.ac.in*

ABSTRACT

Teachers are one of the talent pool in the educational institutions. This talent of teachers must be managed by the institutions. When teachers constitute to be the talent community in the universe of education, universities are at the helm of higher education. Thus it is the duty of universities to manage their teacher talent.

The paper explores the factors that lead towards the talent management of teachers in state universities. Present study explores eleven factors using factor analysing 37 statements. The study is restricted to only the state universities of Karnataka and is limited to teachers only with the sample size of 340 respondents. Thus the study helps in understanding all the factors that universities have to focus on to develop and manage teacher talent in state universities. If universities focus on the explored factors of the study and provide the same for the development of teacher talent, talent management of teachers would happen. The talent of teacher being systematically managed is the recent advancement because till the recent past there was no systems approach to manage teacher talent.

Keywords: Talent, State Universities, Teachers, Teacher development, Systems approach.

Introduction:

The philosophy of people management is based on the belief that human resources are uniquely important to sustain business success. An organization gains competitive advantage by using its people effectively, drawing on their expertise and ingenuity to meet clearly defined objectives. Human resource management is aimed at recruiting capable, flexible and committed people, managing and rewarding their performance and developing key competencies. Today, talent is recognized as an important part of an organisations ability to meet their goals (Decenzo & Robbins, 2002) and the concept that recently has received most attention is Talent Management (Sandler, 2005).

Briefly, Talent Management (TM) is about sourcing, recognizing, recruiting, developing, promoting and retaining people that are high potentials and can grow within the organization as agreed by Laff (2006); Uren (2007); Berger and Berger (2004); and Schweyer (2004). The term of talent management is usually associated with competency based human resource management and management practices. Clunies (2007) acknowledged that innovative colleges and universities are examining the value of talent development as a cost effective process to the transitioning of power and authority. In the vision mission statements of education institutions most likely, employees will be viewed as important assets in order for the college or university to achieve lasting success. Despite this, why is the practice of talent management implemented so infrequently on the administrative side of the higher education environment? Clearly it is not due to a lack of planning skills. Every institution operates based on a strategic plan, its financial future is based on a comprehensive fund raising plan, and facilities are not created or renovated without the presence of a campus master plan (Christie, 2005). Colleges and universities, now more than ever, need to ensure the right person is serving in the appropriate position (Heuer, 2003). Colleges and universities that accept the challenge to build talent from within to meet impending leadership requirements will certainly gain an advantage on peer institutions in this competitive climate (Mackey, 2008).

Research Methodology:**Significance of Research**

The present study is an attempt to explore the possible factors leading towards talent management by using the method of principle component analysis.

Scope of the research

The study is conducted in the selected state universities of Karnataka. Only general state universities are selected for the purpose of the study. The study has both primary and secondary data and is confined to teachers (all cadres) only. Out of the 24 State universities there are 11 general state universities and all eleven are taken for the study. Further 6 universities are categorized as group A and 5 universities are categorized as group B universities based on the

year of their establishment, academic parameters, infrastructural facilities and number of departments. They are as follows.

	Universities	Year	Total	f	%
Group A Universities N = 264	Bangalore University (Bangalore)	1964	273	63	18.5
	Gulbarga University (Gulbarga)	1980	154	35	10.3
	Karnatak University (Dharwad)	1949	189	46	13.5
	Kuvempu University (Shimoga)	1987	122	30	8.8
	Mangalore University (Mangalore)	1980	111	30	8.8
	University of Mysore (Mysore)	1916	291	60	17.6
Group B Universities N = 76	Davangere University (Davangere)	2009	28	9	2.6
	Karnataka State Women University (Biiapur)	2003	71	20	5.9
	Rani Channamma University (Belgaum)	2010	51	13	3.8
	Tumkur University (Tumkur)	2004	97	24	7.1
	Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University (Bellary)	2010	39	10	2.9
	Total		1-426	340	100

The respondents for the study are teachers of all cadres, i.e. assistant professors, associate professors and professors from various streams and departments. The researcher has used the opinionnaire method of field survey research through structured questionnaire.

Objectives

1. To examine the demographic profile of respondents.
2. To explore the possible factors leading towards talent management of teachers.

Sampling Design

The population of the study in 2013 was 1426 teachers from eleven state universities. In the present study probability sampling method was used where approximately 25 % of the population from each cadre was taken as the sample size which is 358 respondents who partially fulfill the requirements of efficiency, representativeness, reliability and flexibility. The entire population was divided in the cadre of assistant professors, associate professors and professors and also divided based on faculties of study. Only complete questionnaires based on the faculties, science 155 out of 161 respondents, commerce 27 out of 31 respondents, arts 139 out of 144 respondents, law 5 respondents and education 14 respondents were taken as the sample size which totals to 24% of the population. Thus only 340 respondents were taken as the sample size for the study.

Research Limitations and Scope for Further Research

The study is restricted to only the state universities of Karnataka and is limited to teachers only. Only 340 teachers form the study core group. The database could be further enlarged to make more detailed analysis possible. Expanding the research to include other university types in other states too would enable one to analyze differences between different university types.

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

TABLE 3.1: SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

TABLE-3.1 A: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS- CATAGORICAL VARIABLES

Demographic Details	Group A Universities		Group B Universities		Total	
	No of Respondents	Percentage	No of Respondents	Percentage	No of Respondents	Percentage
GENDER						
Male	207	78.4%	60	78.9%	267	78.5%
Female	57	21.6%	16	21.1%	73	21.5%
Total	264	100 %	76	100 %	340	100 %
MARITAL STATUS						
Unmarried	16	6.1%	16	21.1%	32	9.4%
Married	245	92.8%	60	78.9%	305	89.7%
Divorcee	2	.8%	0	.0%	2	.6%
Widow/ Widower	1	.4%	0	.0%	1	.3%
Total	264	100.0%	76	100.0%	340	100.0%
DESIGNATION						
Assistant Professor	67	25.4%	39	51.3%	106	31.2%
Associate Professor	85	32.2%	25	32.9%	110	32.4%
Professor	112	42.4%	12	15.8%	124	36.5%
Total	264	100.0%	76	100.0%	340	100.0%
STREAM						
Science	127	48.1%	21	27.6%	148	43.5%
Commerce & Management	23	8.7%	17	22.4%	40	11.8%
Arts	103	39.0%	25	32.9%	128	37.6%
Law	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
Education	10	3.8%	13	17.1%	23	6.8%
Total	264	100.0%	76	100.0%	340	100.0%

78.5% of the respondents in the study were male and 21.5% of the respondents in the study were female. In the group A universities 78.4 % of the respondents were male and 21.6% of the respondents were female. In the group B universities 78.9% of the respondents were male and 21.1% of the respondents are female. Married respondents are 245 (92.8%) and 60 (78.9%) each in groups A and B. 36.5% of the respondents of the study were professors, 32.4% of them were Associate professors and 31.2% of the respondents were assistant professors.

In the group A universities 42.4% of the respondents were professors, 32.2% of the respondents were associate professors and 25.4% of the respondents were assistant professors where as in the Group B universities assistant professor respondents were 51.3%, 32.9% associate professors and only 15.8% of the respondents were professors.

In the group A universities 48.1% of the respondents were from the science stream, 39.0% from arts and only 8.7% of the respondents were from the commerce and management stream. 3.8 % of the respondents were from the education stream and only 0.4% of the respondents were from the law stream. In the group B universities 32.9% of the respondents were from the arts stream, 27.6% from science stream, 22.4% of the respondents were from the commerce and management stream, 17.1% of the respondents were from the stream of education. There is a significant difference in the streams that respondents represent. In the group A universities, the science stream respondents are more and these universities have more of the science departments followed by arts. In the group B universities the arts stream respondents were a majority, followed by science and then the commerce and management stream.

The group A universities have more number of employees who are above 45 years where as group B universities have more number of young employees. 57.8 % respondents had two or more children and 36.4% respondents had only one child. In the group A universities 57.3% respondents had two or more children and 38.3% respondents had only one child. In the group B universities 60% respondents had two or more children and 28.3 % respondents had only one child. The average experience of teachers was 19 years. In the study group A universities had more experienced teachers when compared to group B university teachers.

TABLE 3.2: EXPLORING THE FACTORS LEADING TOWARDS TALENT MANAGEMENT

A factor analysis was conducted to explore the possible factors leading towards talent management by using the method of principle component analysis. Using all the 37 statements factor analysis was performed in order to group these statements based on the strength of inter-correlation between them, called 'Factors' and cluster these statements into the factors. The 37 statements were ranked on five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree towards talent management of teachers. Efforts are made to evaluate if these statements could be grouped in few factors. In order to reduce the number of factors and enhance the interpretability, the factors are rotated. The rotation increases the quality of interpretation of the

factors. The varimax rotation is used to attain simple structure of the data in order to obtain better results for interpretation.

TABLE-3.1 B: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS- QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES

Demographic Details	Group A Universities		Group B Universities		Total		Mean	S.D
	No. of Respondents	%	No. of Respondents	%	No. of Respondents	%		
AGE IN YEARS								
25-35	27	10.2%	20	26.3%	47	13.8%	45.36	8.62
36-45	83	31.4%	38	50%	121	35.6%		
46-55	110	41.7%	16	21.1%	126	37.1%		
Above 55	44	16.7%	2	2.6%	46	13.5%		
Total	264	100%	76	100%	340	100%		
NO OF CHILDREN								
One	95	38.3%	17	28.3%	112	36.4%	2.26	1.55
Two and More	142	57.3%	36	60.0%	178	57.8%		
No issues	11	4.4%	7	11.7%	18	5.8%		
Total	248	100.0%	60	100.0%	308	100.0%		
TEACHING EXPERIENCE								
Total Teaching Experience	No. of Respondents	%	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation		
GROUP A	264	77.65%	4.00	38.00	20.33	8.38		
GROUP B	76	22.35%	1.00	37.00	13.41	7.72		
Total	340	100%	1.00	38.00	18.79	8.72		

In the study, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistic is 0.794 (which is greater than 0.70) indicating that there is an adequacy of sampling to conduct factor analysis. Furthermore, the Bartlett's test of sphericity is used to check whether all the variables are uncorrelated to each other. KMO and Bartlett's test shows that the sample is adequate i.e. $0.794 > 0.5$ and there is also a variation among the statements under consideration as Bartlett's test of sphericity is significant as $p=0.000 < 0.01$.

The factor analysis identified 11 factors with variation explained by 62.62%. Further, the eleven significant factors extracted based on the criteria whose eigen values are greater than one and the factor loading greater than four were identified as: personal experiences in service (Factor I), selection process (Factor II), performance appraisal (Factor III), research

environment (Factor IV), performance indicators (Factor V), recruitment policies (Factor VI), job security (Factor VII), exit policy (Factor VIII), unhealthy experiences (Factor IX), Seniority impact (Factor X), and feedback (Factor XI).

The first factor explained 11.5% variation and the component was the personal experiences in service followed by selection process with 6.9% variance, performance appraisal with 6.8% variance, research environment with 6.2% variance, performance indicators with 6.1% variance, recruitment policies with 4.8% variance, job security with 4.5% variance, exit policy with 4.4% variance, unhealthy experiences with 4.0% variance, seniority impact with 3.8% variance and feedback with 3.6% variance.

Conclusion:

The paper identifies the factors that lead to talent management of teachers in universities. The paper moots an idea that if talent management practices are followed in a systems format in universities then teacher talent can be managed in such a way that universities where talent is nurtured can be a hub of productive talented workforce. . If universities focus on the explored factors of the study and provide the same for the development of teacher talent, talent management of teachers would happen. The talent of teacher being systematically managed is the recent advancement because till the recent past there was no systems approach to manage teacher talent.

REFERENCES:

1. Berger, L. A. & Berger, D. R. (2004): *The talent management handbook: creating organizational excellence by identifying, developing, and promoting your best people*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
2. Christie, D. (2005). *Learning to grow our own: A study of succession planning at Douglas College*. Master's thesis, Royal Roads University (Canada), Canada. Retrieved September 18, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I database. (Publication No. AAT MR05124).
3. Christie, D. (2005). *Learning to grow our own: A study of succession planning at Douglas College*. Masters thesis, Royal Roads University (Canada), Canada. Retrieved June 18, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I database. (Publication No. AAT MR05124).
4. Clunies, J. P. (2007). *Benchmarking succession planning and executive development in higher education: Is the academy ready now to employ these corporate paradigms?* Retrieved June 28, 2012 from http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/Benchmarking_Succession_Planning_Development_in_Higher_Education.shtml
5. DeCenzo, D. A., & Robbins, S. P. (2007). *Fundamentals of human resource management* (9th Ed) Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
6. Heuer, J. J. (2003). *Succession planning for key administrators at Ivy-Plus universities*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, United States -- Pennsylvania. Retrieved

- September 18, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I database. (Publication No. AAT 3084871).
7. Laff, M. (2006). Talent Management: From Hire to Retire. Alexandria. 60(11). 42-50
 8. Mackey, J. A. (2008). *Community college leadership succession: Perception and plans of community college leaders*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona. Retrieved June 28, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I database. (Publication No. UMI 3318486).
 9. Sandler, S. (2005). The top HR issues for 2005. HR focus. 82(1). 12-14.
 10. Schweyer, A. (2004). Talent Management Systems: Best practices in technology solutions for recruitment, retention and workforce planning. Tri-Graphic Printing.
 11. Uren, L. (2007). From talent compliance to talent commitment. Strategic HR Review. 6(3). 32-35.

