



## **IMPEDIMENTS IN THE TALENT DEVELOPMENT OF FEMALE TEACHERS: A STUDY IN SELECTED STATE UNIVERSITIES OF KARNATAKA, INDIA**

Preethi Keerthi D' Souza<sup>1</sup>, Prof P. Pakkeerappa<sup>2</sup> & Ms. P.V Sumitha<sup>3</sup>

### ***Abstract***

*Teachers are a talent community in the universe of education and universities are helm of higher education. Universities constitute an integral part in the development of any nation. The core purpose of a University is to impart education for life and this is done with the help of facilitators and they are the teachers or faculty. In the academic setup, students are taught the concepts of talent management and they implement it in the work places that they join or start. But the irony is that it is not fully implemented in universities even after knowing the results of its implementation.*

*The present research is exploratory in nature and is an attempt to know the perceptions of female teachers, on the role of universities to manage talent i.e. the teacher talent in particular. The main objective of the study is to examine the reasons restricting the development of teacher talent. Thus this study is conducted in the selected state universities of Karnataka. Sample frame consists of 24 state universities. There are 11 general state universities and all eleven are taken for the study. The respondents for the present study are female teachers of all cadres, i.e. assistant professors, associate professors and professors from various streams and departments. The researchers have used the opinionnaire method of field survey research through questionnaires and personally interviewed the respondents.*

*The developed framework and the data in the study provide a meaningful insight into developing teacher talent as teachers are one of the major talent communities in universities. The study gives an insight into many issues of developing teacher talent who in turn shall ignite the talent in students who will be the inputs to corporates.*

*The factors restricting the teacher talent among female teachers are identified. Majority of the respondents in the study agree that development of their talent is restricted by the lengthy regulations and unclear rules of universities followed by the lethargic attitude of officials in the administrative section.*

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Commerce, Mangalore University, Mangalore.

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Business Administration, Mangalore University, Mangalore.

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, AIMIT, St. Aloysius College, Mangalore.



**Keywords:** State Universities, Female Teachers, Talent Management, Talent pool, Restricting Factors.

### **Introduction:**

Universities constitute an integral part in the development of any nation. The core purpose of a University is to impart education for life and this is done with the help of facilitators and they are the teachers/ faculty.

The philosophy of people management is based on the belief that human resources are uniquely important to sustain 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.

### **Why Talent Management is Essential in Higher Education?**

Administrations in higher education can truly benefit from achievements that talent management has had on organizations within other industries. Despite the notion of wanting to be different from the business world, institutions must realize growing talent from within can be of considerable benefit, especially given the current economic climate, increasingly competitive environment for human capital, and the ongoing need of being accountable to its constituents. 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. 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).



In the academic setup, students are taught the concepts of talent management and they implement it in the work places that they join or start. But the irony is that it is not fully implemented in universities even after knowing the results of its implementation. Wolverton&Gmelch (2002) confirmed the limited amount of research related to talent management in higher education is carried and they suggested that few institutions embrace formal developmental programs and leave the growth opportunities to chance instead of relying on a systematic and focused process. Lynch (2007) suggested that colleges and universities fall short of business and industry in developing their own talent. One would expect that, in a knowledge economy, the producers of knowledge would value talent management and even have a competitive edge in that realm. He also stated that most institutions perform well in developing their students, but fall short of assisting their staff in their own skill development. Clunies (2007) suggested that higher education has historically been slow to adopt many corporate management processes. The same is the case with accepting talent management in the academic circle.

### **Research Methodology:**

#### **Significance of Research:**

The present study is **an attempt to know the perceptions of female teachers, on the role of universities to manage talent i.e. the teacher talent in particular.** The main purpose of the study is to examine the impediments in the development of teacher talent in the state universities of Karnataka.

#### **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 only. Out of the 24 universities in state there are 11 general state universities and all eleven are taken for the study. The respondents for the study are female 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 questionnaires.

#### **Objectives:**

- To test if female teachers are considered as talent pool in the field of education.
- To examine the factors restricting the development of teacher talent among female teachers.
- To explore factors acting as impediments in the development of teacher talent among female teachers



### Sampling Design:

In the study probability sampling method is used using random number tables. A purposive sampling is used as the universe in this study happens to be small and finite. The population of the study was 1426 teachers. 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 for the purpose of the study which totals to 25% of the population. Thus only 340 respondents were taken as the sample size for the study among which 267 were male teachers and 73 were female teachers. The present research was restricted to female respondents only.

### Research Limitations:

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 1: Socio Demographic Characteristics Of Respondents**

RESPONDENTS	Frequency (f)	Percentages (%)
Male	267	78.5
Female	73	21.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Interpretation:** Among 340 respondents taken as the sample size for the study, 267 were male teachers and 73 were female teachers. The present research was restricted to female respondents only.

Options	Freq (f)	%	Options	Freq (f)	%	Options	Freq (f)	%
<b>MARITAL STATUS</b>			<b>DESIGNATION</b>			<b>STREAM</b>		
Unmarried	12	16.4	Assistant Professor	19	26.0	Science	25	34.2
Married	60	82.2	Associate Professor	32	43.8	Arts	32	43.8
Divorcee	1	1.4	Professor	22	30.1	Education	8	11.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>	Commerce and Management	8	11.0
						<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>



**Interpretation:**from the above table it is inferred that **82.2% respondents were married**. 42.8% of the respondents of the study were associate professors followed by 30.1% of them were professors. 43.8% of the respondents were from arts stream and 34.2% were from the science stream.

**Table-2 B: Demographic Details- Quantitative Variables**

Demographic Details	Freq (f)	%	Mean	S.D	Demographic Details	Freq (f)	%	Mean	S.D
<b>AGE IN YEARS</b>					<b>TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</b>				
25-35	9	12.3	45.12	8.2	< 10	13	17.8	19.0	8.4
36-45	27	37.0			10-20	31	42.5		
46-55	28	38.4			20-30	22	30.1		
ABOVE 55	9	12.3			30-40	7	9.6		
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>			>40	0	0		
					<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>		

**Interpretation:**From the above table it can be inferred that 38.4% respondents are of the age group of 46 years to 55 years with an average age of 45.12 years and with a variation of 8 years. With respect to teaching tenure 42.5% of the respondents had 10 to 20 years of teaching experience with an average experience of 19 years and with a variation of 8 years.

**TABLE-3: To Test if Teachers are Considered as a Talent Pool in the Field of Education.**

Teachers are a talent pool in the field of education	University	
	Female Respondents	
	Frequency (f)	Percentages (%)
Yes	63	86.3
No	2	2.7
Undecided	8	11.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Interpretation:** From the above table it is observed that 63 (86.3%) female respondents agree that teachers were a talent pool in the field of education. Thus it can be noted that majority of the respondents agreed that teachers were a talent pool in the field of education.



**Table-4: Exploring Factors Acting as Impediments in the Development of Teacher Talent by Factor Analysis for Female Respondents**

Statements	Component						Factors
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Lethargic attitude of officials in the administrative section restrict the development of teacher talent	.820						F1
Influence of politics in academic functioning restrict the development of teacher talent	.781						
Favoring based on caste/ religion is a major hindrance to perform well and this restricts the development of teacher talent	.746						
Restricted financial assistance to attend conferences restricts the development of teacher talent	.569						
Lack of opportunities at work place to showcase talent restrict the development of teacher talent	.531						
Departmental politics and politicking restricts the development of teacher talent		.845					F2
Lack of mentoring and guidance from seniors and university officials restricts the development of teacher talent		.771					
Vacancies not being filled at the department level restrict the development of teacher talent			.874				F3
The effect of 'seniority' at all levels restrict the development of teacher talent			.564				
High egoistic nature of fellow teachers restrict the development of teacher talent			.532				
Lack of self interest restrict the development of teacher talent				.885			F4
I have already reached the helm and do not require further development				.881			
Lack of support staff/ clerks in the department restricts the development of teacher talent					.699		F5
The way of functioning by the present heads of the university restrict the development of teacher talent					.650		
Personal health/ family issues restrict the development of teacher talent						.852	F6
Teaching is financially not a rewarding profession so it restricts the development of teacher talent						.530	
The lengthy regulations and unclear rules of universities restricts the development of teacher talent						.467	
<b>Eigen values</b>	2.98	1.9	1.93	1.85	1.51	1.48	
<b>% of Variance</b>	17.6	11.	11.3	10.9	8.9	8.7	
<b>Cumulative% of Variance</b>	17.6	29.	40.6	51.5	60.4	69.1	

KMO=0.612 ; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = 0.000



Exploring 17 statements through Factor Analysis the impediments the restricting the development of teacher talent were identified. Efforts are made to evaluate if these statements could be grouped in significant few factors. Validity of factor analysis is tested by verifying KMO and Bartlett's test which shows that the sample is adequate i.e.  $0.612 > 0.5$  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 6 factors (F1, F2, F3, F4, F5 and F6) with variation explained by 69.1%. The first factor F1 explained 17.6% of variation and the component is named as 'Performance limiting factors' followed by F2 'Departmental factors' with 11.7% variance, F3 'Seniority factors' with 11.3% variance, F4 'Self seeking factors' with 8.9% variance, F5 'Support factors' with 8.7% variance and factor F6 'Personal factors' with 8.7% variance.

Above factors explored contribute in total 69.1% of total variation and thus there is a scope for further research by increasing the areas restricting the development of teacher talent among female staff.

### **Conclusion:**

The Study identifies the factors restricting the development of teacher talent among female respondents among state universities. The factors explored articulate that teacher talent is limited when there are performance obstacles. The female respondents say that lethargic attitude at the administrative level is a major hindrance. Thus if a conducive learning culture is created and a encouraging environment in universities is constituted, the talent in teachers can be utilized to a maximum extent.

### **References:**

- 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.
- Butterfield, B. (2008). Talent management: Emphasis on action. Talent Management Strategies for Attracting and Retaining at the Best and the Brightest. *CUPA-HR Journal*, 59(1), 34-40



- 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.shm](http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/Benchmarking_Succession_Planning_Development_in_Higher_Education.shm)
- DeCenzo, D. A., & Robbins, S. P. (2007). *Fundamentals of human resource management* (9th Ed) Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
- Laff, M. (2006). Talent Management: From Hire to Retire. *Alexandria*. 60(11). 42-5
- Lynch, D. (2007). *Can higher education manage talent?* Retrieved June 11, 2009 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/11/27/lynch>
- Sandler, S. (2005). The top HR issues for 2005. *HR focus*. 82(1). 12-14.
- Schweyer, A. (2004). Talent Management Systems: Best practices in technology solutions for recruitment, retention and workforce planning. Tri-Graphic Printing.
- Uren, L. (2007). From talent compliance to talent commitment. *Strategic HR Review*. 6(3). 32-35.
- Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *College deans*. Westport: Oryx.