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Abstract: The research study is entitled ‘The Pattern, Intent and Causes of Employees’ Turnover in Debreberhan University.’ The aim in this paper was mainly to investigate the pattern of employees’ turnover using a concrete data from concerned units, and discover the employees’ turnover intentions and the reasons for the turnover intent. In this survey study the investigators used a quantitative research method/design and a stratified sampling technique. To achieve the research objective, data was collected from the existing staffs through a five-point Likert scale structured questionnaire. Besides the overall trend of human resource mobility was collected from the Human Resource Directorate of the organization. A total of 441 questionnaires were distributed proportionately. Out of the 229 questionnaires dispensed to academic employees 147 (64.20%) questionnaires were qualified for analysis. And among the 212 questionnaires dispatched to administrative staff 145 (68.4%) were qualified for analysis. To organize and process the data gathered through the questionnaire the software statistical package for social science (SPSS) was used. And both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to analyze the data. And all the data collected is presented in the form of tables. As per the findings, it is concluded that DBU has had high rate of turnover for the last four years from 2004 to 2007 E.C. (with an average 9.04% and 8.23% turnover rate of academic and administrative employees, respectively) for different reasons. It may also keep facing Turnover of its employees in the future as it is evident from the data analysis that a large amount of the employees of DBU usually think to leave the organization soon if any alternative job comes. For the academic staff it is the push factors that have positive and significant contribution to intention to quit. But for the administrative employees it is the pull factors found to have positive and significant contribution to intention to quit. The main push causes of turn over intention in both the academic staff and administrative staffs are: inadequate salary, inadequate fringe benefits, and inadequate motivation and encouragement, among others.
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1. Introduction

Human power is the key resource to any organization. Goals that are set at corporate level can be achieved through the unreserved effort exerted by employees of any organization. Similarly, instructors and administrative staff members in higher institutions, such as Debreberhan University, have indispensable role to work towards producing capable and competent graduates that the labor market requires to accomplish different tasks. Hence, proper handling of the human power in any organization is the major focus to any manager to be competent in the competitive and dynamic business world through reducing turnover of experienced and best employees.

Employees’ turnover is a well-recognized issue of critical importance to the organizations. The question of employee turnover has come to gain greater attention especially in this new century. Organizations all over the world, in various industries, have faced this problem at some stages of their evolution. Companies now take a deep interest in their employee turnover rate because it is a costly part of doing business. Lack of employees’ continuity involves high costs in the induction and training of new staff. Organizational
productivity is also one of the challenges that arise as a consequence of turnover [1]. There are costs like costs of replacing the leaving employee, costs of training and development (both on the job and off the job training costs), indirect costs like costs of stoppage and postponement of tasks, etc. As the result of excessive turnover organizations incur additional costs and holdup their performance. Existing staffs will be stressed due to the additional responsibilities to cover the vacant posts. With regard to financial costs, for instance, NGOs are forced to allocate significant amount of money. For vacancy advertisement up to Birr 1,035 per half a page of one time advertisement on newspaper and recruitment costs like pre-employment medical cost Birr 300, transportation to duty station Birr 1300, travel expense Birr 400 for a single employee, Group orientation Birr 2160, Relocation/shipment expenses for personal belonging ETB 1,500.00. Even smaller organizations are forced to assign personnel to process frequent staffs resignations and recruitment activities.

As the result of the high turnover in the organizations, most of them are exposed to low productivity in terms of quality and quantity of work [2]. This may in return significantly affect the organization by creating difficulties of achieving its desired mission at the required time.

In case of higher educational institutions, the cost of employees’ turnover is higher as human resources with knowledge and competences are the key assets and it affects the academic and research activities of the universities. Quitting in the mid of semester, the effect is very high as it is difficult for both the university to arrange the substitute and student to adjust/accept new instructor in the mid of course the same is true for administrative employees.

Debreberhan University as an emerging higher education institution is trying to its level best make remarkable records in the achievements of educational quality goals of the nation. And it is by utilizing its human resource capabilities that the desired accessibility and quality of education is to be ensured. Therefore, retaining the competent employees is more valuable than hiring new employees since it is as such difficulty to replace them.

And as a matter of fact, a number of efforts have been made by Debreberhan University to make its working environment conducive to its workers: many things have been changed since the establishment of the university in 1999 E.C. especially the facilities essential to employees in the effective and efficient performance of their job like offices, computers, internet services, availability of books and other equipment’s, cafeteria services, a well fenced gardens of the compass, provision of housing services and training and development opportunities are the most evident good job done so far, among others. These efforts along with the health advantage of the natural weather condition of the town, Debreberhan, can attract employees to and retain in the university.

However, there may be further work expected to be done if it is possible to retain some of the employees moving out of the organization. Being able to make workers to stay in their current job is as crucial as or may be more important than giving them opportunities for training and development.

To do this, clearly discovering the real trend of turnover during the seven years life time of the university, and knowing the causes of the intent to turnover is mandatory as it could possibly help in finding the solutions the university should be able to perform in its future run of producing competent students in the market.

And so, as employee’s turnover is a widely researched phenomenon, a huge amount of theoretical and empirical literature identified various factors/reasons responsible for employees’ turnover. However, there is no standard reason why people leave organizations [3].

Retention of employees has been termed as one of the most significant challenges of the 21st century [4]. Studies have differentiated between actual turnover and turnover intent, with more focus on turnover intent. Actual turnover is more difficult to predict because it involves the study of those individuals who have left their organizations. It is difficult to trace such individuals and to retrieve data from them. However, turnover intent is termed to be the most predictive sign of actual turnover in an organization [5].

In today’s world of knowledge based economy, universities are recognized as major actors in economic development and growth. In order to play this role successfully, universities need to have well qualified and motivated staffs. This involves both the academic and administrative staffs. University employees, especially, academic staffs are a key resource to institution’s success. The performance of academic staff, both as teachers and researchers determines, to a large extent, the quality of the student experience of higher education and has a significant impact on student learning and thereby on the contribution that such institutions can make to society. However, one of the biggest challenges many African Universities continue to face is the attraction and retention of top performers [6]. Employee retention is becoming an important issue for organizations. For that reason, the study mainly focused on the turnover intention and causes of intent to turnover in Debreberhan University.

2. Statement of the Problem

The costs of employee turnover and replacement are huge and becoming less bearable in the fast paced economy. Public Universities in Ethiopia, altogether, have been experiencing accelerated labor turnover seemingly due to different factors [7].

As one of the higher education institutions in Ethiopia, Debreberhan University is facing the problem of high turnover as more choices have become available to a limited pool of instructors. For instance, according to the data from the human resource management directorate of Debreberhan University 87 (78 male and 7 female) instructors and 75 (49 male and 26 female) administrative employees that total 162 employees have vacated their current job from July, 2012 to October 18, 2013 alone. Compared to the 409 instructors,
471 administrative employees and 68 technical assistances that make a total of 948 employees that are on job in the same year, this rate of turnover is a bit high.

In Debreberhan University, it was reported and observed that a number of instructors make decision about quitting academics for different known and/or unknown reasons. Some of the general reasons mentioned in the exit questionnaires filled out by employees who quit their job are resignation, and transfer. And specifically a few of the causes, which were specified in the annual performance report and some from the employees’ informal communications in the university, which drive the employees not to stay in the organization understudy are: inadequacy of the benefit package (compensations); closeness of the university to the capital city of the country, Addis Ababa, where there can be wide chance of applying for vacancies to be employed in permanent and part time basis; for positions that are better paying which enable them accumulate enough financial resource; and to ensure comfortable retirement.

Almost no studies have been carried out on turnover intentions in the university so far and no significant remedial action is in use to address this problem in the university. Preliminary findings from other industries carried out in different countries have pointed out different reasons for intentions of employees to quitting a job. And the preliminary study made in this research has found out some reasons of turnover in Debreberhan University. However, without further investigation, the same reasons explored for other industries cannot be claimed for Debreberhan University. And the aforementioned causes of turnover in organization under study need more tangible data through detailed inquiry.

Therefore, this study mainly aimed to figure out the pattern of employees’ turnover using a concrete data from concerned units, and discover the employees turnover intentions and the reasons for the turnover intent, verify the level significance of relationship between pull factors of turnover, push factors of turnover, personal factors of turnover, and the turnover intention.

2.1. Research Questions

Hence our specific research questions were:

i. How does the pattern of employees’ turnover look like?

ii. What extent of the existing employees is having intention to leave?

iii. Which college/school/institute is the most susceptible for turnover?

iv. What are the causes of intent to quit the job?

v. Do the overall pull factors of turnover have positive and significant relationship with turnover intention?

vi. Do the overall push factors of turnover have positive and significant relationship with turnover intention?

vii. Do the overall personal factors of turnover have positive and significant relationship with turnover intention?

2.2. Specific Objectives

The study comprises the following specific objectives

i. To find-out the pattern of turnover experienced in DBU over the last four years

ii. To know the turnover intention of employees

iii. To identify the most susceptible college/school/institute for turnover

iv. To investigate the main causes of intent to turnover

v. To discover the level of significance of the relationship between the push factors of turnover and turnover intention

vi. To discover the level of significance of the relationship between the pull factors of turnover and turnover intention

vii. To discover the level of significance of the relationship between the personal factors of turnover and turnover intention

2.3. Hypotheses and Theoretical Framework of the Study

This research study has three independent variables namely personal factors, pull factors and push factors and one dependent variable i.e. turnover intention. On the top the study the researchers tried to see to what extent personal, pull and push factors contributes in the employees’ turnover intention in Debreberhan University and which factor contributes more significantly.

The following hypothesis were tested in this study

H1: Personal factors have positive and significant contribution to turnover intention

H2: Pull factors have positive and significant contribution to turnover intention

H3: Push factors have positive and significant contribution to turnover intention

The following model depicts the relationship among the independent and dependent variables, forming the theoretical framework.

![Figure 1. Theoretical Framework.](image)

3. Significance of the Study

This study is among the few first comprehensive studies of teachers’ turnover in Ethiopian public universities specifically in Debreberhan University. It might have both practical and theoretical significance:

i. It may advance knowledge and understanding of the causes of academic turnover in Debreberhan University and it may also be used to assist public policy
formulators and the university administrations in formulating strategies to increase job satisfaction, retention rates and organizational commitment among employees. So, it will provide a basis to make amendments to improve the working conditions of instructors and other employees in order to retain them.

ii. It gives an answer and clear out the controversies about the pattern and causes of turnover by giving clear insight to different stakeholders.

iii. The result of the study can be extrapolated across the higher education sector in the rest of universities in Ethiopia and quality standards of education can therefore be raised by having satisfied and committed instructors and other employees.

iv. It can also be used as reference by those potential researchers in and out of Debreberhan University for further researches that may be carried out in the future.

4. Research Design and Methodology

4.1. Research Design

According to Wolman and Kruger (2004), the research design describes the plan in which information is obtained from the research participants. In the plan it must be clearly illustrated how participants will be selected in order to get valid and reliable research results. The investigators in this study used a quantitative method. The study is survey type used to assess turnover intention of instructors and administrative employees.

4.2. Sample and Sampling Technique

To determine the sample size the formula for calculating a sample for proportion was used.

\[
SSo = \frac{Z^2 \times P(1-P)}{C^2}
\]

Where: SS = Sample Size  
Z = Z-value (e.g., 1.96 for a 95 percent confidence level)  
P = Percentage of population picking a choice, expressed as decimal  
C = Confidence interval, expressed as decimal (e.g., 0.04 = +/- 4 percentage points)  
Correction for finite population:

\[
SS = \frac{SSo}{1-\frac{(C^2 \times N)}{Pop}}
\]

Where: Pop =Population  
Source: http://williamgodden.com/samplesizeformula.pdf

In 2014/15 there are 870 instructors (Male =658, Female=63) and 797 administrative/supportive workers including technical staff that make a total of 1667 employees.

Applying the sample determination formula and assuming 95% confidence level, P = 0.5, and confidence interval= 0.04, out of those employees who are currently on job 441 were planned to participated in the study. Proportionately 229 respondents were from the academic staff and the remaining 212 were from administrative staff. From the population appropriate sample for questionnaire administration was determined by using stratified sampling technique to give equal weights for Faculties, Colleges, Institutes and the supportive staff in the university.

4.3. Source of Data and Data Collection Method

The researchers employed (used) both primary and secondary data. First hand data was collected through questionnaire filled by the existing academic and supportive staffs of Debreberhan University. With regard to secondary sources, documents/files from human resource management directorate of the university were referred to take data of employees’ turnover during 2004 to 2007 E.C. And to support the research study with other related researches we have looked at the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Central Statistical Agency Analytical Report on the 2013 National Labor Force Survey.

4.4. Instrument and Procedure of Data Collection

Data was collected from 441 workers of Debreberhan University using structured questionnaire. In the the questionnaire each statement was measured using a 1-5 Likert Scale with a rating of 1 indicating “Not at all” and a rating of 5 indicating “Very high.” The questionnaire was adopted from previous researches and modified in a way suitable for this study.

4.5. Methods of Data Analysis and Presentation

To organize and process the data gathered through the questionnaire the software statistical package for social science (SPSS) was used. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to analyze the data. The descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) help to describe the general level of agreement of respondents to the factors/causes of turnover and turnover intention. It reveals the conformity of respondents’ perception about the factors/causes of turnover and turnover intention.

Likewise, the inferential statistics i.e. the correlation, and analysis of variance results generated from the package were used to test the hypotheses developed. The correlation analysis help know the nature of relationship or the degree of association between the factors/causes of turnover and the turnover intention. ANOVA was also used to investigate if significant difference exists in turnover intention among the different age groups, marital status, and among the different levels of education.

The demographic data of both administrative and academic staff in the form of frequency and percentage are presented in tables. The pattern of the employees’ turnover from 2004 to 2007 E.C. is also presented in tables and bar-graphs. Correspondingly, the descriptive statistics result in the form of mean and standard deviation as well as the correlation analysis, and ANOVA results are presented in tables as well.
5. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

Employees’ attitude survey was done on the causes and intention of turnover. A total of 441 questionnaires were distributed proportionately with 229 questionnaires to the academic staff and the remaining 212 to the administrative staff. Out of the 229 questionnaires dispensed to academic employees 147 (64.20%) questionnaires were returned and qualified for analysis. And among the 212 questionnaires dispatched to administrative staff 145 (68.4%) were gathered and qualified for analysis. And so, the researchers believe that the response rate is adequate to carry out the analysis and performed it accordingly.

Thus, the data collected through the questionnaire supported by the findings of labor mobility by federal statistical agency and the data from the human resource directorate about the pattern of employees’ turnover are analyzed and interpreted in this section. This chapter mainly comprises the demographic characteristics of respondents, the descriptive statistics, and the inferential statistics including correlation analysis and the analysis of variance to address all the objectives and hypotheses of the study.

5.1. Pattern of DBU Employee Turnover

Turnover is calculated as the ratio of persons who left the agency for any reason to the total number of persons at the end of each fiscal year. Therefore, according to the data we had from the human resources directorate, the turnover rates of Debreberhan University during the period of September 2004 E.C to August 2007 E.C. of both administrative and academic staffs are as follows.

| Year in E.C | Academic staff | Administrative staff |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------|
|             | Employees who quit | Number of Employees At the end of Fiscal year | Turnover rate (%) | Employees who quit | Number of Employees At the end of Fiscal year | Turnover rate (%) |
| 2004        | 60              | 644                   | 9.32               | 33              | 441                   | 7.5               |
| 2005        | 52              | 678                   | 7.67               | 60              | 573                   | 10.5              |
| 2006        | 97              | 762                   | 12.73              | 56              | 706                   | 7.93              |
| 2007        | 56              | 872                   | 6.42               | 58              | 841                   | 7.00              |

As cited in HRVoice.org 2009, ‘The April 2009 issue of the Academy of Management Journal of the article entitled “Searching for the Optimal Level of Employee Turnover”; the researchers discovered that there is no optimal level of turnover for full-time employees. In fact, they found that 0% was the ideal voluntary turnover rate simply because the loss of productivity was too great when any employee left, regardless of whether or not they were performing employees. This shows that the fewer the number of employees who quit the organization the better, since each newly hired employee will have associated challenges for the organization. But this might not be the optimal rate of turnover for part-time employees.

Therefore, from the above table and the respective Bar charts of patterns of employees’ turnover of Debreberhan University employees we can see that the highest turnover was shown in 2005 E.C while the lowest was scored in 2007 E.C in both the administrative and academic staffs.

Calculating the average turnover rate of employees of Debreberhan University it becomes 9.04% and 8.23% for academic and administrative employees, respectively. This rate is then far more than the ideal (best) turnover rate of zero for full-time employees.

To support the above analysis [8] concludes that substantial evidence indicates that turnover rates have negative implications for several dimensions of organizational performance (e.g., safety, productivity, and monetary), that the content of turnover rates plays a role in the magnitude and form of the relationship between turnover rates and organizational performance, and that turnover rates affect distal measures (e.g., profitability, financial performance) through decreased productivity and losses in human and social capital. It is obvious that irrespective of the level/amount of turnover rate, employees’ turnover is costly. Different literatures estimate that turnover can cost from 30 to 250% of the employees’ annual salary to replace them, depending on the employees’ level, experience, skill, etc. So, it is important to only reduce turnover of full-time employees as much as possible.

Therefore, from the above data of employees’ turnover rate we can conclude that the organization understudy has been losing substantial number of its academic and administrative employees in each of the previous four years for different reasons. And thereby it can be said that Debreberhan University has been incurring the possible implicit and explicit costs of turnover.

5.2. Descriptive Statistics

In this section the mean score, frequency and percentage were calculated to determine the level of agreement of respondents of their intention to quit job, the mean and standard deviation values/scores are also used to investigate the most exposed college to turnover, and finally the causes of turnover were also ranked comparing their mean value/score. The following criterion was designed by Best (1977) as cited by Melese, A. [9]. And in this research 1 is assigned to strongly disagree/Not at all and 5 to strongly agree/Very high. So, the translation of level ranking is analyzed based on the following criteria.

i. Agreement level 1.00 – 1.80 Means strongly disagree/not at all
ii. Agreement level 1.81 – 2.60 Means disagree/very low
iii. Agreement level 2.61 – 3.40 Means neutral/low
iv. Agreement level 3.41 – 4.20 Means agree/high
v. Agreement level 4.21 – 5.00 Means strongly agree/very high

As it is indicated above the analysis for respondent’s level of agreement to each statements were made accordingly.

5.2.1. DBU Employees’ Intention to Quit Job

As it has been noted by different sources intention to quit is a predictor of an actual turnover. With this in mind we have asked the respondents about their general intent to leave their current organization. So, regarding this issue employees were given two questions whether they would leave their current job soon if they find job and if they often think about quitting their job.

Then the staffs’ general intent to leave their current job based on their agreement level to the questions asked is presented below in Table 2 for both the academic and administrative staffs. And so the following result has been found according their response.

### Table 2. DBU Employees’ Intention to quit job.

| Degree of Agreement | Academic staff | Administrative staff |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|
|                     | Frequency | Percentage | Mean | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
| Strongly disagree   | 2        | 1.3        |      | 3        | 2.1        |      |
| Disagree            | 7        | 4.8        |      | 6        | 4.1        |      |
| Neutral             | 16       | 10.9       |      | 23       | 15.9       |      |
| Agree               | 40       | 27.2       | 4.3  | 37       | 25.5       | 4.2  |
| Strongly agree      | 82       | 55.8       |      | 76       | 52.4       |      |
| Total               | 147      | 100%       |      | 145      | 100%       |      |

As Table 2 indicates the majority of the academic staff of DBU 112 (83%) of the participants agreed that they have the intention to quit their current job but only 9 (6.1%) of the respondents do not have the intention to leave while 16 (10.9%) of the respondents remain neutral. Likewise, the majority of the administrative staff 113 (77.9%) do agree that they will leave their current job if they find an alternative job but only 9 (6.1%) of the respondents do not have the intention to leave while 23 (15.9%) of the respondents remain neutral. And the mean values of each category of staff are 4.3 and 4.2 for academic and administrative staff respectively. These mean values as per the degree of agreement criteria provided above lies on strongly agree.

Therefore, it is evident that a large amount of the employees of DBU are having strong intention to quit and usually think to leave the organization soon if any comfortable alternative job comes. As per the literature turnover intention is a predictor of actual turnover and the fact that most of the employees of DBU have an intention to quit would cost the organization its employees in which it invested (direct and indirectly) the last couple of years for training (on-the-job and off-the-job) and developing them and other costs like costs of selection and recruitment, existing employees moral loss, work load to the existing staff, the stoppage/delay of work till new employees are hired, etc.

5.2.2. Comparison of Intention to Quit Job among Colleges of DBU

One of the objectives of the study is to discover which college of DBU is vulnerable to turnover. This section then specifically addresses this objective of the study by comparing the mean values of intention to quit asked to the participants. Table 3 below summarizes the mean/score of responses from the academic staff of DBU.

### Table 3. Comparison of Intention to Quit Job among Colleges/Institutions/Schools.

| College/Institution/School | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Rank |
|----------------------------|-----|------|----------------|------|
| A Business and Economics   | 19  | 4.4  | 0.69           | 5th  |
| B Engineering              | 33  | 4.0  | 1.24           | 8th  |
| C Law                      | 4   | 4.5  | 0.58           | 3rd  |
| D Natural science          | 18  | 4.6  | 0.49           | 2nd  |
| E Education                | 2   | 4.5  | 0.71           | 4th  |
| F Computing science        | 15  | 4.3  | 0.90           | 6th  |
| G Health science           | 24  | 4.7  | 0.55           | 1st  |
| H Social science           | 24  | 4.1  | 1.03           | 7th  |
| I Agriculture              | 8   | 3.6  | 1.19           | 9th  |
| Total                      | 147 | 4.3  | 0.94           |      |

As it can be seen from Table 3 above Health Science with an intention to leave mean value of 4.7 is ranked first, Natural Science College with an intention to leave mean value of 4.6 is ranked second, employees in College of Law are 3rd most susceptible to turnover and College of Agriculture is ranked 9th with a mean value of 3.6. However, when we look at their agreement level they all lie on agree and strongly agree that mean employees in every college want to leave if they possibly get other jobs.

Hence, the three most turnover vulnerable colleges/institutions in DBU are Health science, Natural science, and College of Law while college of Agriculture is the least susceptible one. This is so may be for different reasons which we did not include in this study (the reason why the above three colleges happens to the most susceptible to turnover).

5.2.3. Causes of Employees’ Turnover Intention

In this section both the academic and administrative have given an answer to the question inquired to them concerning what the major enforcing factors would be that may oblige them to think about resigning from their current organization.

The following three consecutive Tables have summarized the
Pull factors are those reasons that attract the employee to a new place of work. In some papers pull factors are named as uncontrolled factors because it is out of the control of organizations.

With regard to the pull factors of turnover, in an effort to distinguish the first five major causes of intention to quit the main factors were ranked by contrasting the mean values of responses from 147 academic staff and 145 administrative staff participants of the study.

Accordingly, for the academic staffs almost all the above mentioned factors with mean value greater than 3.4 are highly enforcing them to resign: higher/better salary, Career advancement / promotion, good organization culture, more financial benefits, more respect and values by the management and other staff of the organization, more freedom and autonomy, more research facilities and fund, good organization support, career advancement/promotion, well reputation of other alternative organizations, job security outside, better financial benefit of establishing own-business, location of alternative organizations in good region / city, except for work load (with mean value of 2.94) and availability of good education for children (with mean value of 2.99) which have low influence on turnover intention of the academic staff.

As to the administrative staff, majority of the pull factors which score a mean value of greater than 3.4 (higher/better salary, more respect and values by the management and other staff of the of the organization, career advancement / promotion, more financial benefits, good organization culture, location of alternative organizations in good region / city, good organization support, and more freedom and autonomy) are highly influencing them to have an intention to resign.

But issues related to job security (with mean value of 3.34), less work load (with mean value of 3.34), higher education opportunities (with mean value of 3.34), availability of good education for children (with mean value of 3.08), well reputation of other alternative organizations (with mean value of 3.24), better financial benefit of establishing own-business (with mean value of 3.29) are not highly enforcing factors.

Then, the five most influencing pull factors of turnover intention of academic staff of DBU are higher/better salary (with mean value of 4.23), good organization culture (with mean value of 4.16 and standard deviation of 0.85), more financial benefits (with mean value 4.16 and standard deviation of 0.92), more respect and values by the management and other staff of the organization (with mean value of 4.15), and more freedom and autonomy (with mean value of 4.05).

In the same way, the five most influencing pull factors of turnover intention of administrative staff are higher/better salary (with mean value of 3.98), more respect and values by the management and other staff of the of the organization (with mean value of 3.86), career advancement / promotion (with a mean value of 3.83), more financial benefits (with mean value of 3.80), good organization culture (with a mean value of 3.55).

Among the pull factors, what we can find in common in both the academic staff and administrative staffs are: higher salary, more respect and value, good organizational culture, and more financial benefits.

**Table 4. Pull Factors of Employees Turnover Intention.**

| Academic Staff | Administrative Staff |
|----------------|----------------------|
| **Pull Factors** | **Mean** | **Std. Dvn.** | **Rank** | **Pull Factors** | **Mean** | **Std. Dvn.** | **Rank** |
| 1. Higher/better salary | 4.23 | .93 | 1<sup>st</sup> | 1. Higher/better salary | 3.98 | 1.04 | 1<sup>st</sup> |
| 2. Career advancement / promotion | 3.98 | .99 | 8<sup>th</sup> | 2. Career advancement / promotion | 3.83 | 1.02 | 3<sup>rd</sup> |
| 3. More research facilities and fund | 4.01 | .99 | 6<sup>th</sup> | 3. Job security outside | 3.34 | 1.151 | 1<sup>st</sup> |
| 4. Job security outside | 3.71 | 1.01 | 10<sup>th</sup> | 4. Other alternative organizations are located in good region / city | 3.51 | 1.09 | 6<sup>th</sup> |
| 5. Other alternative organizations are located in good region / city | 3.63 | 1.14 | 12<sup>th</sup> | 5. More freedom and autonomy | 3.43 | 1.11 | 8<sup>th</sup> |
| 6. More freedom and autonomy | 4.05 | 1.01 | 5<sup>th</sup> | 6. More respect and values | 3.85 | 1.14 | 2<sup>nd</sup> |
| 7. More respect and values | 4.15 | .88 | 4<sup>th</sup> | 7. Good organization culture | 3.55 | 1.01 | 5<sup>th</sup> |
| 8. Good organization culture | 4.16 | .85 | 2<sup>nd</sup> | 8. More financial benefits | 3.80 | 1.15 | 4<sup>th</sup> |
| 9. More financial benefits | 4.16 | .92 | 3<sup>rd</sup> | 9. Less work load (life-work balance) | 3.34 | 1.12 | 9<sup>th</sup> |
| 10. Less work load (life-work balance) | 2.94 | 1.00 | 14<sup>th</sup> | 10. Higher education opportunities | 3.34 | 1.15 | 10<sup>th</sup> |
| 11. Higher education opportunities | 3.74 | 1.23 | 10<sup>th</sup> | 11. Availability of good education for children | 3.08 | 1.18 | 14<sup>th</sup> |
| 12. Availability of good education for children | 2.99 | 1.30 | 13<sup>th</sup> | 12. Good organization support | 3.50 | 1.07 | 7<sup>th</sup> |
| 13. Good organization support | 3.99 | .95 | 7<sup>th</sup> | 13. Well reputation of other alternative organizations | 3.24 | 1.07 | 13<sup>th</sup> |
| 14. Well reputation of other alternative organizations | 3.80 | .86 | 9<sup>th</sup> | 14. Better financial benefit of establishing own-business | 3.29 | 1.16 | 12<sup>th</sup> |
| 15. Better financial benefit of establishing own-business | 3.73 | 1.13 | 11<sup>th</sup> | - | - | - |

N 147 | N 145
Personal factors such as health problem, family related issues, children education and social status contribute in turnover intentions. However, very little amount of empirical research work is available on personal related factors. Generally, we cannot say that the above personal factors, like health problem, family related problems, influence of co-workers who left etc., are not forcing both the academic and administrative employees of DBU as all their mean values are above 1.8 and below 3.41. But it can be concluded that their influence is low/very low.

### Table 5. Personal Factors of Employees Turnover Intention.

| Personal Factors                              | Mean | Std. Dvn. | Rank |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|-----------|------|
| 1. My health problem                          | 2.73 | 1.44      | 7th  |
| 2. My family related problem                  | 3.07 | 1.35      | 4th  |
| 3. My children education: because good schools are not available in the city | 2.42 | 1.32      | 10th |
| 4. Social status of teachers is quite low     | 3.37 | 1.27      | 2nd  |
| 5. Teaching is difficult job                  | 2.31 | 1.26      | 11th |
| 6. Some of my friends/relatives are changing jobs | 2.42 | 1.21      | 9th  |
| 7. Because of absence of fun                  | 2.64 | 1.33      | 8th  |
| 8. I do not like the style/personality of my immediate boss | 2.80 | 1.33      | 6th  |
| 9. I want to leave with my family as my organization is located in other area | 3.07 | 1.30      | 3rd  |
| 10. I am unable to publish research paper as required | 2.99 | 1.22      | 5th  |
| 11. I am unable to follow the organization’s rules and regulation | 3.64 | 1.31      | 1st  |

N 147

### Table 6. Push Factors of Employees’ Turnover Intention.

| Push Factors                                      | Mean | Std. Dvn. | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|-----------|------|
| 1. My salary is not enough to fulfill my needs    | 4.47 | .84       | 1st  |
| 2. Fringe benefits are less                       | 4.31 | .93       | 2nd  |
| 3. My job is not secured                          | 3.07 | 1.20      | 13th |
| 4. Size of present organization is small          | 2.67 | 1.05      | 19th |
| 5. Organization is located in small town          | 2.73 | 1.14      | 18th |
| 6. The job is not according to my social status   | 2.65 | 1.16      | 21st |
| 7. The working environment is not good            | 3.97 | 1.11      | 5th  |
| 8. Lack of motivation and encouragement for good work | 4.03 | 1.14      | 4th  |
| 9. There is conflict among employees              | 2.79 | 1.12      | 17th |
| 10. Lack of recognition of my work                | 3.70 | 1.13      | 8th  |
| 11. Lack of freedom in present organization       | 3.67 | 1.22      | 9th  |
| 12. Lack of career advancement                    | 3.58 | 1.14      | 10th |
| 13. Lack of research facilities and opportunities | 3.86 | 1.02      | 6th  |
| 14. More office work load                         | 2.80 | 1.13      | 16th |
| 15. More teaching work load                       | 2.86 | 1.12      | 15th |
| 16. The Job makes me too tired to enjoy my family life | 2.67 | 1.13      | 20th |
| 17. My job does not give me enough time for my family | 2.63 | 1.12      | 22nd |
| 18. Superiors get too involved/intervened in my job | 3.48 | 1.18      | 11th |
| 19. Disrespect by the students                    | 3.05 | 1.26      | 14th |

| Administrative Staff                              | Mean | Std. Dvn. | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|-----------|------|
| 1. My health problem                              | 2.94 | 1.28      | 5th  |
| 2. My family related problem                      | 2.90 | 1.20      | 6th  |
| 3. My children education: because good schools are not available in the city | 2.80 | 1.22      | 7th  |
| 4. Social status of my work title is quite low    | 3.16 | 1.27      | 3rd  |
| 5. My job is difficult job                         | 3.14 | 1.21      | 4th  |
| 6. Some of my friends/relatives are changing jobs | 2.77 | 1.23      | 8th  |
| 7. Because of absence of fun                      | 2.75 | 1.19      | 10th |
| 8. I do not like the style/personality of my immediate boss | 3.19 | 1.25      | 2nd  |
| 9. I want to leave with my family as my organization is located in other area | 2.76 | 1.34      | 9th  |
| 10. I am unable to follow the organization’s rules and regulation | 3.28 | 1.31      | 1st  |

N 145

1. My salary is not enough to fulfill my needs
2. Fringe benefits are less
3. My job is not secure
4. Size of present organization is small
5. Organization is located in small town
6. The job is not according to my social status
7. The working environment is not good
8. Lack of motivation and encouragement for good work
9. There is conflict among employees
10. Lack of recognition of my work
11. Lack of freedom in present organization
12. Lack of career advancement
13. Lack of research facilities and opportunities
14. The Job makes me too tired to enjoy my family life
15. My job does not give me enough time for my family
16. Superiors get too involved/intervened in my job
17. Disrespect by the management/superiors
18. There is no fairness/justice in the Organization
19. Excessive attendance

The above factors are highly enforcing them to think about leaving their current organization.

And for the administrative staff similar result has been found to that of the academic staff: no personal factor is a serious reason for turnover intention of the administrative staff because all the personal factors have mean score of below 3.41 but above 1.8 which indicates low or else very low influence on turnover intention.

Generally, we cannot say that the above personal factors, like health problem, family related problems, influence of co-workers who left etc., are not forcing both the academic and administrative employees of DBU as all their mean values are above 1.8 and below 3.41. But it can be concluded that their influence is low/very low.
Push factors are aspects that push the employee towards the exit door. In the literature it is also called controlled factors because these factors are internal and can be controlled by organizations.

Regarding the push causes of intention to leave their job, in the same way to the above pull factors and personal factors, we have ranked the main push factors by contrasting the mean values of responses from 147 academic staff and 145 administrative staff participants of the study so as to distinguish the first five major causes of intention to quit.

According to the results in Table 6 above the following push factors of turnover are not major causes of turnover intent for the academic staff: job security, perception about smallness in size of present organization, perception about location of the organization being in small town, possible existence of conflict among employees, the job being not according to their social status, office and teaching work load, work-life balance, and disrespect by the students. All these do have a mean value between 1.8 and 3.4, which indicates that they have only low/very low influence on the employees’ intention to leave. And the remaining push factors have high influence in intention to quit.

Correspondingly, as to the administrative employees Table 6 above indicates the push factors which have only low or very low influence are: possible existence of excessive attendance, too much interference/involvement of superiors/managers, work load, lack of work-life balance, lack of freedom, possible existence conflict among employees, job insecurity, perception about smallness in size of present organization, perception about location of the organization being in small town, and the job being not according to my social status. All these do have a mean value between 1.8 and 3.4, which indicates that they have only low/very low influence on the employees’ intention to leave. And the remaining push factors have high influence in intention to quit.

On the contrary, the mean value of response from participants shows the five most influencing push factors of turnover intention of academic staff of DBU are in adequate salary to fulfill their personal needs (with a mean value of 4.47), inadequate fringe benefits (with a mean value of 4.31), the existence of unfairness or less justice in the organization (with a mean value 4.10), lack of motivation and encouragement for good work (with a mean value of 4.03), and less comfortable working environment (with a mean value of 3.97).

And as to the administrative employees, inadequate salary (with a mean value of 4.28), lack of motivation and encouragement for good work (with a mean value of 4.12), inadequate fringe benefits (with a mean value of 4.11), lack of career advancement (with a mean value of 3.88), and disrespect by the management/superiors (with a mean value of 3.85) are the first five push factors of intent to turnover.

The common push factors for both the academic and administrative staffs are inadequate salary, inadequate fringe benefits, and inadequate motivation and encouragement.

And the salary and benefit issues are also listed as the major pull factors of both administrative and academic staffs. The factor related possibility of career advancement/promotion is mentioned among the most serious pull factors for administrative staff than the academic staff.

### 5.3. Inferential Statistics

In this section of analysis of the study, a simple bivariate correlation was employed to test all its hypotheses. Correlation analysis helps to know the degree of relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient is a statistic that indicates the degree to which two variables are related to one another. The sign of a correlation coefficient (+ or -) indicates the direction of the relationship between −1.00 and +1.00. Variables may be positively or negatively correlated. A positive correlation indicates a direct, positive relationship between two variables. A negative correlation, on the other hand, indicates an inverse, negative relationship between two variables [10].

In this section the three hypotheses developed were tested based on the correlation result summarized in Table 7 below.

| Variable | Academic Staff | Administrative Staff |
|----------|----------------|----------------------|
|          | Turnover Intention | Turnover Intention |
|          | Pearson Correlation(r) | Sig. (2-tailed) | Pearson Correlation(r) | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Pull Factors | -0.016 | 0.843 | 0.215** | 0.009 |
| Personal Factors | 0.054 | 0.517 | 0.030 | 0.719 |
| Push Factors | 0.388** | 0.000 | 0.005 | 0.956 |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Source: Survey Results (2016).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 147 for AcS and n = 145 for AdS

H1: Personal factors have positive and significant contribution to turnover intention
According to the correlation result in Table 7 above for the academic staff \((r = 0.054, p = 0.517)\), there exists positive but not significant relationship between turnover intention and personal factors of turnover. And for the administrative staff, the correlation result is \((r = 0.030, p = 0.719)\) which shows a positive but not significant relationship between turnover intention and personal factors of turnover.

Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected for both academic staffs and administrative staffs.

H2: Pull factors have positive and significant contribution to turnover intention

As far as the relationship between pull factors and the turnover intention for the academic staff is concerned, the correlation result in Table 7 above reveals a negative relationship with a correlation coefficient value of \((r = -0.016)\), \((p\text{ value of } 0.843)\) which is not significant at \((p = 0.05)\). However, for the administrative staff the correlation coefficient for pull factors is \((r = 0.215**)\), \((p\text{ value of } 0.009)\) which indicates a positive and significant relationship \((at\ p = 0.01)\).

Thus, the hypothesis is rejected for the academic employees and it is accepted for the administrative staff.

H3: Push factors have positive and significant contribution to turnover intention

Still looking at Table 7 above the academic employees response result indicates a correlation coefficient of \((r = 0.388**)\) and \((p\text{ value of } 0.000)\) which point out a positive and significant \((at\ p = 0.01)\) relationship of pull factors of turnover and turnover intention. Nevertheless, for the administrative staff the relationship of pull factors of turnover and turnover intention as per the result is positive with correlation coefficient of \((r = 0.005)\) but not significant \((with\ p\text{ value of } 0.956)\) at \(p = 0.05\).

Consequently, the hypothesis is accepted in case of the academic staff and it is rejected in case of the administrative staff.

6. Conclusions

i. The result of data analysis shows that in the last four years DBU has been losing substantial number of its employees \((with\ an\ average\ 9.04\%\ and\ 8.23\%\ turnover\ rate\ of\ academic\ and\ administrative\ employees)\) for different reasons. The fact that considerable number of its academic and administrative employees served less than a year can indicate DBU has hired substantial number of employees to replace those who quit their job.

ii. DBU may keep facing Turnover of its employees in the future as it is evident from the data analysis that a large amount of the employees of DBU are having strong intention to quit and usually think to leave the organization soon if any comfortable alternative job comes.

iii. Turnover intention is found to be higher in the Health Science, Natural Science and Law Colleges than the rest of colleges.

iv. Looking at the specific pull factors independently, the major causes of turn over intention in both the academic staff and administrative staffs are: higher salary elsewhere, more respect and value, good organizational culture, more financial benefits, more freedom and autonomy \((for\ the\ academic\ staff)\) and career advancement / promotion \((for\ the\ administrative\ staff)\).

v. The personal factors in general have low influence on both academic and administrative employees’ turnover intention. But, the academic staffs are not able to comply with the rules and regulations of the organization which is the only major personal cause of intention to quit.

vi. The major push causes of turn over intention in both the academic staff and administrative staffs are: inadequate salary, inadequate fringe benefits, inadequate motivation encouragement and the existence of unfairness or less justice with less comfortable working environment \((for\ the\ academic\ staff)\) and lack of career advancement including disrespect by the management/superiors \((for\ administrative\ staffs)\).

vii. Altogether, for the academic staff it is the push factors that have positive and significant contribution to intention to quit. But for the administrative employees it is the pull factors found to have positive and significant contribution to intention to quit.
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