

Impact of Induction and Recruitment Practices on Faculty Retention: A study of Private Management and Engineering Colleges in Delhi



Priyanka Bareth
Research Scholar
Deptt.of Management,
College Name,
Jaipur, Rajasthan

Abstract

In last decade private professional education institutes in the field of engineering and management have grown manifold. However, retaining qualified faculty pose an intimidating challenge to the management in these institutes. Present study is focused on exploring the impact of induction and recruitment practices on faculty retention in **Private Management and Engineering colleges** in **Delhi** which will help researcher in developing a concrete relationship model for faculty retention in these institutions. This study is quantitative in nature. Primary data was collected through survey questionnaire from 50 faculty members of private professional management and engineering colleges in Delhi. Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis were employed to examine the relationship. Findings suggested that both induction and recruitment practices have significant impact on faculty retention. Besides, induction has greater impact on faculty retention than recruitment practices.

Keywords: Faculty Retention, Employee Retention, Induction And Recruitment Practices.

Introduction

India is growing into a talent hub due to its demographic dividend advantage. It has a competitive advantage over other economies due to its young population. This young population, however, need to be trained properly to make most of this demographic dividend lead. Thus, the quality of higher education young professionals receive is very important. Everybody will agree with the adage "teachers create future leaders". Therefore, education which our future leaders derive is very much dependent upon dedication of our present faculty. This is only one side of the story. On the other side, professional education institutes are facing acute shortage of qualified and experienced faculty who can play a key role in building the strong base for entire generation of leaders. In India, there has been a phenomenal growth in the field of higher education lately which has increased the demand for qualified faculty. Besides, various Government initiatives taken in this direction and exponential growth in unaided private institutions in the last decade have added to the already existing dearth of qualified faculty in the country. Therefore there is an urgent requirement to address the issue of recruitment and retention of qualified and talented faculty. Authorities have to keep in mind that while number of faculty should increase, their quality should not deteriorate.

Scope of Research

In the current study researcher has tried to explore the relationship between the dependent variable faculty retention and independent variables induction and recruitment practices for private management and engineering colleges in Delhi.

Geographical Coverage

Delhi, the National Capital Territory of India, is a metropolitan region in India. Population of Delhi was 18.6 million in 2016. It is the largest city in India in terms of area. The Urban region surrounding Delhi has been given special status of National Capital Region (NCR) in 1991 by 69th amendment Act of Indian Constitution.

The political administration of Delhi today more closely resembles that of a state of India, with its own legislature, high court and an executive council of ministers headed by a Chief Minister. New Delhi is jointly

administered by the federal government of India and the local government of Delhi.

Industry Coverage

The private sector, which currently accounts for 59% of all tertiary enrolment, is growing rapidly, providing most of the professional courses, especially engineering and management. Thus the private sector is certainly going to play a significant role in the future expansion of higher education in India. One of the major expansion initiatives of twelfth plan is quality growth of private sector in Higher education. Current study, therefore, is focussed on education sector. Researcher has focussed her attention to study the faculty retention practices in **privately managed and engineering colleges of Delhi**. For the purpose of the study, unaided private colleges approved by AICTE (2015-16) were taken into account. The study did not take into account private deemed universities, university managed private colleges and private aided colleges.

Objectives of the study

1. To study the impact of induction on faculty retention.
2. To study the impact of recruitment practices on faculty retention.

Review of Literature

Faculty Retention

Employee retention in relation to corporate sector has been studied enormously. However retention in the field of education has been seldom researched so far. Faculty retention is serious not only from financial point of view but also from moral point of view. But also from moral point of view. When a faculty leaves he/she takes with him his knowledge and morale of the students. When individuals leave an educational institute, the synergy which was created due to a group of academicians working together gets disturbed which result in diminished scope of production and dissemination of knowledge (Tetty, 2006)

By 2020, India will be the world's third largest economy, with a correspondingly rapid growth in the size of its middle classes. Currently, over 50% of India's population is under 25 years old; by 2020 India will outpace China as the country with the largest tertiary-age population (Report of British Council "Understanding India - the future of higher education and opportunities for international cooperation"). Thus colleges and universities should be able to recruit and more importantly retain qualified faculties to prepare these future Indian leaders.

Teacher's retention factors generally revolves around three categories – Personal Factors (demographics, marital status, family); External Factors (societal, institutional and economic); and Employment Factors (commitment, employability professional qualification, working conditions, monetary and other rewards) (Bonnie S. Billingsley, 1993). Three types of collegial relationship (affirmative, professional and working colleagues) were found to be strong retention forces. Recognition was another retentive factor among faculty (Nienhuis, Robert W., 1994). Faculty socialization must also include sessions on collegiality, collaboration and

peer relationships. Such socialization programs which make the transition to new institute easier for new faculties are very important in retaining these faculties in the long run (Dolly, John P., 1998). Attrition among teachers can be attributed to the factors like salary and incentives, working conditions, induction and professional development and assignments (Herbert and Ramsay, 2003). Within the teaching profession major factors that cause turnover could be categorized into "commitment to the organization, long-term prospects, and job satisfaction" (Xaba, 2003). Research can serve as a basis for B-school leadership to analyse their existing retention and recruitment policies and establish tailor-made strategies to recruit and retain their academic staff in the wake of globalization (Verhaegen, Paul, 2005). Institutions with higher compensation showed lower turnover rates. Presence of Union was also identified as one of the important determinant of faculty turnover (Matthew P. Nagowski, 2006). Top 5 reasons identified for faculty to remain in current institute, in their order of preference are (1) autonomy in work and decision making, (2) geographical location, (3) fringe benefits, (4) relationship with department colleagues, and (5) familial ties and responsibilities (Conklin, M Desselle, S., 2007). Discipline specific issues are missing from the comprehensive faculty retention models developed so far e.g. in some disciplines faculty may leave because of lack of research support while in other they may leave because of work culture issue (Yonghong Jade Xu, 2008). The research suggests that systems that give equal weightage to research, teaching and service are more attractive to faculties. This research proved that institutes which gave equal importance to research and teaching were better able to retain their employees (David E. Terpstra & Andre L. Honoree, 2009). While developing their employee retention strategies, colleges do not have to work much upon the issue of the geographic location, but have to work really hard on advancement opportunities facet (S.M. Shariq Abbas et al, 2011). There is strong positive relationship of pay satisfaction and learning & growth opportunities with retention. However learning opportunities have higher impact on employee retention than pay satisfaction (Rana Zeeshan Mubarak, Zaira Wahab and Naveed R Khan, 2012). Quality of work life (QWL) dimensions significantly affect job performance and job satisfaction and consequently impact retention (Sathya Narayanan. S, Umaselvi. M, & Mohammed Ibrahim Hussein, 2012-13). Institutions mainly depend upon walk-ins, their unsolicited databases and referrals for faculty recruitment. Quality and competence is put at stake in order to fill the vacancy as soon as possible. Institutions which invest time and money in recruitment, training and development of their faculty reap the benefits in the form of higher faculty retention (Ms. N Malati and Mr. Prakash Sharma, 2013). Major retention factors are: Better compensation, working conditions, motivation, recognition, relationship with co-workers, growth opportunities, training, comfortable working hours (Dr. Lalitha Bala krishnan & Vijayalakshmi. M, 2014).

Induction/Socialization

Socialization as a concept has been studied from diverse angles. Organizational socialization has been defined as the process by which an individual acquires the attitudes, behaviour, and knowledge needed to participate as an organizational member (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Socialization creates a person-organization fit and those who have undergone a dynamic socialization process fit the firm's values better than those who do not (Jennifer A. Chatman, 1991). Organizational tactics both impact the possibility that newcomers get involved in different pro-active tactics and that they influence the effectiveness of pro-active tactics that occur. Exact relationships vary as a function of the specific organizational tactics and specific newcomer pro-active tactics (Andrea E.C. Griffin, Adrienne Colella and Srikanth Goparaju; 2000). Newcomers' perceived supervisor support dropped during the period 6–21 months after organizational entry. The research further revealed that sharper the decline in perceived supervisor support, greater is the degree of decline in socialization outcomes of role clarity and job satisfaction (Markku Jokisaari & Jari-Erik Nurmi, 2009). Content and social tactics of socialization positively influence person-job fit while context tactic does not influence person-job fit significantly. Indirect influence of person-job fit on retention intention can be inferred as person-job fit positively influence job satisfaction and satisfaction, in turn, positively influence retention intention (Nucharee Supatn, January 2011). Organizations that want to engage new employees should use social socialization tactics to create positive emotions, develop higher person-job fit perceptions, and strengthen newcomers' self-efficacy belief (Alan M. Saks & Jamie A. Gruman, 2011). Induction process (both its procedural and social aspects) can have a significant positive impact on employee engagement. However this is highly dependent on certain variables e.g. management style, that an organisation must control. It is ultimately the manager who will drive the induction process. While doing so if he chooses to ignore certain important facets of engagement-induction link, the whole process can have little or even negative impact on employee engagement (Anthony Lewis, Brychan Thomas and Owen Bradley 2012). Satisfaction with buddying has a positive relationship with work engagement and psychological capital. The satisfaction with the buddy/ work engagement relationship was fully mediated by psychological capital, providing support for Saks & Gruman's (2011) socialization resources theory. The results accentuate the valuable role buddying can play as part of organizational socialization from a positive organizational behaviour perspective (Neelam Nigah, Ann J. Davis & Scott A. Hurrell 2012).

Recruitment Processes

Hiring the right individual is the first step towards effective employee retention. Your selection process sets the parameters for the future stability of your employees and consecutively the growth of your organization (Liz Kislik, April 2005). Effective retention practices start with good hiring practices--qualified

and motivated people will stay longer. Poor hiring practices increase turnover in two ways: new staff members that are mismatched and disoriented will leave quickly; experienced staff, on the other hand, can become highly frustrated at the revolving door of newcomers that places a continual burden on their time and performance (Branham, 2005). For all organizations, the hiring of employees who appreciate and implement its mission and strategy is critical to the organizations' success. While all employees in all organizations are important, university tenure track faculty members play an enormous role in the success (or failure) of the organization. Physical entities such as buildings and laboratories are significant, but it is the intellectual human capital embodied in the faculty that determines the ultimate fate of the university (William P. Cordeiro, June 2010). Perceptions of rewards based on fair appraisal and job security have an effect on retention and moreover, overall perceptions of human resource management increased retention (Hiroshi Yamamoto, 2013)

Thus, from the limited literature available on faculty retention major retentive factors for faculty were identified as: Employment Factors e.g. commitment, employability, professional qualification, working conditions, monetary and other rewards, relationship with colleagues, recognition, faculty induction, growth opportunities, compensation and importance given to research. From the literature available on socialization and recruitment practices, it is clear that both have been studied as concepts and as their impact on employee retention. However, there are still many areas with reference to faculty retention which are seldom studied e.g. impact of socialization (Induction) and recruitment practices on faculty retention has been rarely explored. Moreover, in case of higher education when retention is talked about, it is mostly about student retention and not faculty retention. Therefore, researcher has tried to reduce this gap by studying impact of induction and recruitment practices on faculty retention in private management and engineering colleges in Delhi and NCR.

Research Methodology**Survey Instrument**

The questionnaire for measuring faculty retention, Induction (Socialization) and recruitment practices was developed on the basis of inferences obtained from review of the subject. Pre-testing of the questionnaire was done by getting the same examined by three academicians. Final questionnaire contained following number of items (Table 1.1). Each item was evaluated on 5 point Likert scale ranging from 5: strongly agree; 4: agree; 3: neither agree nor disagree; 2: Disagree to 1: strongly disagree.

Table No.1.1

No. of items taken to measure faculty retention, Induction and recruitment practices in final questionnaire

| S no. | Variable | No. of items |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Faculty Retention | 27 |
| 2 | Induction | 7 |
| 3 | Recruitment Practices | 7 |
| | Total | 41 |

Data Collection

Present study was conducted on the faculty members of private management and engineering colleges of Delhi.

For the purpose of the study researcher has downloaded the list of all unaided-private colleges for engineering and management in Delhi for year 2015-16 approved by AICTE (All India Council for Technical Education). AICTE is the governing body for engineering and management colleges. It defines the qualifications, roles, salaries etc. of all categories of faculty members in management and engineering colleges. Only unaided private colleges were considered for the study. The study did not take into account private deemed universities, university managed private colleges and private aided colleges. Then, in all, 6 colleges were randomly selected for the study. In order to enhance the richness of the data and to obtain variegated responses colleges selected

consisted of management as well as engineering courses.

The questionnaires, including covering letter, were personally distributed to the faculties of 6 colleges in Delhi in the month of April-May 2017. Non-probability sampling technique of judgemental sampling was used to choose colleges in Delhi. Population consisted of 590 faculty for the 6 colleges selected for study. Overall 100 questionnaires were distributed in the colleges. No. of questionnaires distributed in each college ranged from 15-20. Non-probability judgemental sampling method was used to choose the faculty from these colleges. Finally, of the 100 survey questionnaires individually administered, 59 questionnaires were received at the response rate of 59 per cent. On further refinement, 54 questionnaires were found to be completely and properly filled. For the sake of convenience 50 responses were taken in the study.

Results and Discussions**Demographic profile of the respondents**

Demographic characteristics of the respondents is summarised in table no. 1.2. It is clear from the table that male and female faculty contributed almost equally to our data. Majority of the contributing faculty was married, between 35-50 years of age group and at the designation of associate professor in the current organization. Regarding qualification, majority of the responding faculty was Ph.D. followed by PG and MPhil.

Table No. 1.2
Demographic profile of respondents

| S. no. | Respondent's Characteristics | Frequency | % of Respondents |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| 1 | Gender | | |
| | Male | 24 | 48 |
| | Female | 26 | 52 |
| 2 | Marital Status | | |
| | Married | 42 | 84 |
| | Unmarried | 8 | 16 |
| 3 | Age | | |
| | Less than 35 | 18 | 36 |
| | 35-50 | 32 | 64 |
| | More than 50 | - | - |
| 4 | Qualification | | |
| | PG | 15 | 30 |
| | MPhil. | 4 | 8 |
| | PhD | 31 | 62 |
| 5 | Total Experience | | |
| | Less than 3 years | 2 | 4 |
| | 3-6 years | 4 | 8 |
| | 7-10 years | 18 | 36 |
| | More than 10 years | 26 | 52 |
| 6 | Association with current Institute | | |
| | Less than 3 years | 10 | 20 |
| | 3-6 years | 22 | 44 |
| | 7-10 years | 16 | 32 |
| | More than 10 years | 2 | 4 |
| 7 | Designation | | |
| | Assistant Professor/Lecturer | 19 | 38 |
| | Associate Professor/Reader | 31 | 62 |
| | Professor | - | - |

Assessment of reliability

Reliability refers to the degree to which the survey instrument produces stable and consistent results. The reliability of items was calculated by computing the coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Coefficient of alpha (Cronbach alpha) should be

above 0.7 to be acceptable (Nunnally,1978). In the present study researcher has calculated the Cronbach alpha for each of three variables individually and Cronbach's alpha for all the items taken together. Values of Cronbach alpha for each of these variables is as follows:

**Table No. 1.3
Cronbach Alpha Values**

| S no. | Variable | Cronbach's alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | No. of Items |
|-------|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Faculty retention | 0.795 | 0.831 | 27 |
| 2 | Socialization Process (Induction) | 0.860 | 0.870 | 7 |
| 3 | Recruitment Practices | 0.724 | 0.731 | 7 |
| | Overall | 0.887 | 0.904 | 41 |

Note: Value of Coefficient of alpha greater than 0.7 is acceptable

As shown in table 1.3, value for Cronbach coefficient of alpha for all variables ranged between 0.72 and 0.93 indicating good consistency among the items within each variable.

Correlation and Regression analysis

Two main objectives of the research are:

1. To study the impact of Socialization process on faculty retention
2. To study the impact of Recruitment practices on faculty retention

Related hypotheses are as follows:

Null Hypothesis 1

Socialization does not have significant impact on faculty retention.

Alternate Hypothesis 1

Socialization has significant impact on faculty retention.

Null Hypothesis 2

Recruitment Practices do not have significant impact on faculty retention.

Alternate Hypothesis 2

Recruitment Practices have significant impact on faculty retention.

Correlation Analysis

In order to test above hypotheses and establish the relationship between the dependent variable faculty retention and independent variables of socialization process (Induction) and recruitment practices, correlation and regression analysis was carried out.

**Table 1.4
Correlations**

| | | FR | Induction | RR |
|-----------|---------------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| FR | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .717(**) | .539(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Induction | Pearson Correlation | .717(**) | 1 | .360(*) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | | .010 |
| | N | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| RR | Pearson Correlation | .539(**) | .360(*) | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .010 | |
| | N | 50 | 50 | 50 |

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

FR is Faculty Retention

From the table 1.4above it is clear that there is positive significant correlation between outcome variable faculty retention and predictor variable Induction (0.746). Also, there is positive significant moderate correlation between outcome variable faculty retention and predictor variable recruitment practices (0.556). Correlation between recruitment

practices and faculty retention is moderate but highly inclined towards strong correlation (as a rule of thumb correlation value between 0.6 to 0.8 is considered to be strong).Further, in order to determine the relative impact of two independent variables on the dependent variable, data set was put to multiple regression analysis.

Multiple Regression Analysis
Overall model fit

Table No. 1.5
Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 |
| 1 | .778(a) | .605 | .588 | 6.21557 |

Predictors: (Constant), Induction and Recruitment Practices

Dependent Variable: Faculty Retention

In the above table value for adjusted R square is .588 which means that independent variables can explain 58.8% of the variation in dependent variable. In other words socialization process and recruitment practices together account for 58.8% of the variations in faculty retention. Alternatively, we can say that 41% of variation in faculty retention is not explained by our predictor

variables. Thus, there are some other factors present which influence faculty retention which require further research in the field.

ANOVA

ANOVA table tells us whether our model, overall, predicts the outcome variable significantly. In the table below F value is 35.943 which is significant at $p < .001$.

Table No. 1.6
ANOVA

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|---------|
| 1 | Regression | 2777.212 | 2 | 1388.606 | 35.943 | .000(a) |
| | Residual | 1815.768 | 47 | 38.633 | | |
| | Total | 4592.980 | 49 | | | |

Predictors: (Constant) Recruitment Practices, Induction

Dependent Variable: Faculty Retention

Table 1.7
Unstandardized & Standardized Coefficients
Coefficients (a)

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | B | Std. Error |
| 1 | (Constant) | 40.525 | 7.766 | | 5.218 | .000 |
| | Induction | 1.206 | .197 | .601 | 6.114 | .000 |
| | RR | 1.005 | .306 | .323 | 3.282 | .002 |

Dependent Variable: Faculty Retention

In table 1.7 constant {Unstandardized Coefficients (B)} states that when no effort is made to retain employees through induction and recruitment practices faculty retention will be approximately 40 units. Value for Overall Induction {Unstandardized Coefficients (B)} is 1.206 which means that a unit change in Induction practices will lead to 1.206 units of change in faculty retention. Similarly, value for overall recruitment practices {Unstandardized

Coefficients (B)} is 1.005 which means that a unit change in recruitment practices will lead to 1.005 units of change in faculty retention.

Moreover, the analysis identified induction as more significant factor influencing faculty retention in private professional higher education institutes in Delhi. This is because standardized coefficient (Beta) is higher for induction (0.601) than recruitment practices (0.323) as shown in table no. 1.7.

Hypotheses Assessment

Table 1.8
Hypotheses Assessment

| S no. | Hypotheses Statement | Unstandardized Coefficients | Sig. Levels | Findings |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------|
| 1 | H ₀ : Socialization does not have significant impact on faculty retention | 1.206 | .000 | Rejected |
| | H ₁ : Socialization has significant impact on faculty retention | | | Accepted |
| 2 | H ₀ : Recruitment Practices does not have significant impact on faculty retention | 1.005 | .002 | Rejected |
| | H ₂ : Recruitment Practices have significant impact on faculty retention | | | Accepted |

Remarking An Analisation

Thus the results highlighted that both Induction and recruitment practices have significant impact on faculty retention. Therefore, on the basis of our statistical results, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternate hypotheses. (Table 1.8)

Conclusion

Main objectives of this research were to examine the impact of Induction and recruitment practices on faculty retention. For achieving the above mentioned objectives, firstly, correlation between the variables was computed. Faculty retention was found to be positively correlated with both the predictors, namely, Induction and recruitment practices at 1% level of significance. Through multiple regression analysis we found that almost 59% of the variation in faculty retention can be described by our predictor variables called Induction and recruitment practices. Moreover, the analysis identified induction as more important factor than recruitment practices influencing faculty retention in private professional higher education institutes in Delhi. This is because standardized coefficient (Beta) is higher for induction (0.601) than recruitment practices (0.323). Thus, while formulating the retention policies for their respective institutes HR personnel should emphasize both Induction and recruitment practices. However, it will be beneficial to put more stress on induction procedures than on recruitment practices. Institutions should start investing in retaining employees. HR policies should be aligned with the retention policy. Institutions and Universities can take advantage of this research by inculcating the results in their retention strategies with the purpose of enhancing the efficiency of the institutes.

References

1. Balakrishnan, Lalitha. "A Study on Retention Strategy's followed by Education Institutions in Retaining Qualified Employees." *SIES Journal of Management* 10.1 (2014)..
2. Billingsley, Bonnie S. "Teacher retention and attrition-in special and general education: A critical review of the literature." *The Journal of Special Education* 27.2 (1993): 137-174..
3. Cordeiro, William P. "A business school's unique hiring process." *Business Education Innovation Journal* 2.1 (2010): 56-60..
4. Dolly, John P. "The Induction and Socialization of New Faculty: The Role of the Professional Development School." (1998).
5. Griffin, Andrea EC, Adrienne Colella, and SrikanthGoparaju. "Newcomer and organizational socialization tactics: An interactionist perspective." *Human resource management review* 10.4 (2000): 453-474.
6. Jokisaari, Markku, and Jari-Erik Nurmi. "Change in newcomers' supervisor support and socialization outcomes after organizational entry." *Academy of Management Journal* 52.3 (2009): 527-544.
7. Kaur, Prabjot. "An empirical study on factors affecting faculty retention in Indian business schools." *Managing in Recovering Markets*. Springer, New Delhi, 2015.63-73.

8. Lewis, Anthony, Brychan Thomas, and Owen Bradley. "Employee socialisation: A platform for employee engagement?." *International Journal of Employment Studies* 20.1 (2012): 25.
9. Liz Kislik.A hire authority.Cross Channel.Prism Business Media (2005), 43-44.
10. Mubarak, Rana, ZairaWahab, and N. Khan."Faculty retention in higher education institutions of Pakistan." (2012).
11. Nagowski, Matthew P. "Associate professor turnover at America's public and private institutions of higher education." *The American Economist* 50.1 (2006): 69-79.
12. Nienhuis, Robert W. "Satisfied Faculty and Involved Chairpersons: Keys to Faculty Retention. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper." (1994).
13. Nigah, Neelam, Ann J. Davis, and Scott A. Hurrell. "The impact of buddying on psychological capital and work engagement: an empirical study of socialization in the professional services sector." *Thunderbird International Business Review* 54.6 (2012): 891-905.
14. Oladapo, Victor. "The impact of talent management on retention." *Journal of business studies quarterly* 5.3 (2014): 19.
15. O'Reilly III, Charles A., Jennifer Chatman, and David F. Caldwell. "People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit." *Academy of management journal* 34.3 (1991): 487-516.
16. Saks, Alan M., and Jamie A. Gruman. "Getting newcomers engaged: The role of socialization tactics." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 26.5 (2011): 383-402.
17. Sathya Narayanan, S., M. Umaselvi, and Mohammed Ibrahim Hussein. "Quality of Work Life and its Impact on Behavioural Outcomes of Teaching Faculty: An Empirical Study in Oman Higher Education Context." *Skyline Business Journal* 8.1 (2012).Supatn N. (2011).A Role of Socialization Tactics on the Perceived Person-Job fit of new Employees.Proceedings of the European Conference on Management, Leadership& Governance. Academic Conferences, 391-401.
18. Terpstra, David E., and Andre L. Honoree."The effects of different teaching, research, and service emphases on individual and organizational outcomes in higher education institutions." *Journal of Education for Business* 84.3 (2009): 169-176.Tetty, J.W. (2006). *Staff Retention in African Universities: Elements of a Sustainable strategy*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
19. Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. "Towards a theory of organizational socialization" *Research in Organizational Behaviour* Vol. 1 (1979) : 204-264. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
20. Verhaegen, Paul. "Academic talent: Quo vadis? Recruitment and retention of faculty in European business schools." *Journal of Management Development* 24.9 (2005): 807-818.

Remarking An Analisation

21. Xaba, Mgadla Isaac. "Managing teacher turnover." *South African Journal of Education* 23.4 (2003): 287-291.
 22. Xu, Yonghong Jade. "Gender disparity in STEM disciplines: A study of faculty attrition and turnover intentions." *Research in Higher Education* 49.7 (2008): 607-624.
 23. Yamamoto, Hiroshi. "The relationship between employees' perceptions of human resource management and their retention: from the viewpoint of attitudes toward job-specialties." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 24.4 (2013): 747-767.
- Webliography**
24. https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_do_I_combine_8_different_items_into_one_variable_so_that_we_will_have_6_variables_using_SPSS
 25. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UROF87XZqKgCombining>
 26. https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_do_I_combine_8_different_items_into_one_variable_so_that_we_will_have_6_variables_using_SPSS
 27. <http://www.theanalysisfactor.com/likert-scale-items-as-predictor-variables-in-regression/>
 28. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WQeAsZxsXdQ>
 29. http://www.zenithresearch.org.in/images/stories/pdf/2011/Dec/zijmr/29_VOL%201_ISSUE8_ZEN.pdf
 30. <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/vol3-issue4/A0340108.pdf?id=5464>
 31. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-81-322-1979-8_5
 32. <http://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/delhi-population/>
 33. <http://www.indiaonlinepages.com/population/delhi-population.html>