

Talent Management Practices –An Exploratory Study Of State Universities Of Karnataka

Mrs. Preethi Keerthi DSouza^a, Prof P. Pakkeerappa^b, Ms. P.V Sumitha^c

^aAssistant Professor, Department of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Commerce, Mangalore University. Mangalore, 574199.

^bProfessor, Department of Business Administration, Mangalore University. Mangalore, 574199.

^cAssistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, AIMIT, St. Aloysius College, Mangalore 575022.

Abstract: In this globalized era, it is only the human resource that can provide an organization the competitive edge because under the new trade agreements, technology can be easily transferred from one country to another and there is no dearth for sources of cheap finance. But it is the talented workforce that is very hard to find. In academics, talent plays a vital role because in this field talent is created and nurtured. Teachers are considered as a talent. This paper focuses on teachers as talents and what the universities need to do to manage and develop this talent. The respondents for the present study are teachers of all cadres from 11 general state universities and the universities were categorized into two groups (A and B) based on the year of their establishment and academic parameters. The population of the study was 1426 teachers. Approximately 25 % of the population from each cadre was taken as the sample size which is 340 respondents. The paper discusses the areas wherein support must be given to teachers and in which areas teachers are expecting a boost from universities in order to develop their talent. The practices of talent management are also analysed and the satisfaction level of these factors are measured by the researchers. The paper moots an idea that if the talent management practices are followed in a systems format in universities then the teacher talent can be managed in such a way that universities wherein talent is nurtured can be a hub of productive talented workforce.

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

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, where change is the only constant factor, it is important for an organization to develop the most important resource of all - the Human Resource. In this globalized era, it is only the human resource that can provide an organization the competitive edge because under the new trade agreements, technology can be easily transferred from one country to another and there is no dearth for sources of cheap finance. But it is the talented workforce that is very hard to find. The philosophy of people management is based on the belief that human resources are uniquely important to sustain business success. An organization gains competitive advantage by using its people effectively, drawing on their expertise and ingenuity to meet clearly defined objectives. 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 Schwyer (2004). The term of TM 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 TM 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 TM 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 TM 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 TM 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 TM in the academic circle.

LITERATURE REVIEWS ON THE ABSENCE OF DEVELOPING TALENT AT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Butterfield(2008) Higher education is historically an egalitarian culture resistant to formal identification of heirs apparent. In fact, very few studies have been published addressing the TM strategies within four-year colleges and universities. Wolverton&Gmelch (2002) confirmed the limited amount of research related to TM in higher education in which 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 TM 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 managerial 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 TM. Heuer (2003) believed the concept of TM in higher education is an area that continues to remain largely unexplored. Such comments raise concerns about the lack of attention TM has been given in our industry. While many institutions do not appear to be investing in their talent through formal methods, the business sector continues to comprehend the value that colleges and universities provide to their own workforces. In other words, institutions are doing well to serve outside organizations in their training and development needs while limiting such benefits to internal personnel. This gap is assessed and hence this study.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Significance of Research:The present study is an attempt to know the perceptions of 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 how well talent is managed in both, group A and group B state universities of Karnataka and to know the difference if any.

4.2 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 State universities there are 11 general state universities and all eleven are taken for the study. Further 6 universities are categorized as group A and 5 universities are categorized as group B universities based on the year of their establishment and academic parameters. They are as follows.

	Universities	Year	Total	f	%
Group A Universities N = 264	Bangalore University (Bangalore)	1964	273	63	18.5
	Gulbarga University (Gulbarga)	1980	154	35	10.3
	Karnatak University (Dharwad)	1949	189	46	13.5
	Kuvempu University (Shimoga)	1987	122	30	8.8
	Mangalore University (Mangalore)	1980	111	30	8.8

	University of Mysore (Mysore)	1916	291	60	17.6
Group B Universities N = 76	Davangere University (Davangere)	2009	28	9	2.6
	Karnataka State Women University (Biiapur)	2003	71	20	5.9
	Rani Channamma University (Belgaum)	2010	51	13	3.8
	Tumkur University (Tumkur)	2004	97	24	7.1
	Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University (Bellary)	2010	39	10	2.9
	Total		1426	340	100

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

4.3 Objectives:

- To examine the mode of talent identification of teachers by universities.
- To know the areas of support essential for teachers.
- To measure the level of satisfaction with regard to the TM practices followed in universities.

4.4 Sampling Design:

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

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

DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

TABLE 5.1: SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

TABLE-5.1 A: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS- CATAGORICAL VARIABLES

Demographic Details	Group A Universities		Group B Universities		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
GENDER						
Male	207	78.4	60	78.9	267	78.5
Female	57	21.6	16	21.1	73	21.5
Total	264	100	76	100	340	100
MARITAL STATUS						
Unmarried	16	6.1	16	21.1	32	9.4
Married	245	92.8	60	78.9	305	89.7
Divorcee	2	.8	0	.0	2	.6
Widow/ Widower	1	.4	0	.0	1	.3

Total	264	100.0	76	100.0	340	100.0
DESIGNATION						
Assistant Professor	67	25.4	39	51.3	106	31.2
Associate Professor	85	32.2	25	32.9	110	32.4
Professor	112	42.4	12	15.8	124	36.5
Total	264	100.0	76	100.0	340	100.0
STREAM						
Science	127	48.1	21	27.6	148	43.5
Commerce & Management	23	8.7	17	22.4	40	11.8
Arts	103	39.0	25	32.9	128	37.6
Law	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.3
Education	10	3.8	13	17.1	23	6.8
Total	264	100.0	76	100.0	340	100.0

Above table infers that 78.5% of the respondents in the study were male and 21.5% of the respondents in the study were female. 89.7% respondents were married. 36.5% of the respondents of the study were professors, 32.4% of them were Associate professors and 31.2% of the respondents were assistant professors. 43.5% of the respondents were from science stream and 37.6% were from the arts stream.

TABLE-5.1 B: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS- QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES

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

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

TABLE 5.2: TO EXAMINE THE MODE TO IDENTIFY THE TALENT OF TEACHERS

	Group A		Group B		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
University Identifies Talent Of Teachers By Competencies	64	24.2	40	52.6	104	30.6
University Identifies Talent Of Teachers By Results	87	33.0	14	18.4	101	29.7
University Identifies Talent Of Teachers By Potentials	56	21.2	14	18.4	70	20.6
University Does Not Identify Talent Of Teachers	84	31.8	15	19.7	99	29.1

From the above table it can be inferred that 104 (30.6%) respondents state that their universities identify talent of teachers by competencies followed by results [101 (29.7%) respondents]. 99 (29.1%) respondents say that universities do not identify teacher talent. In group A universities 87 (31.8%) respondents opine that universities of group A identify talent of teachers by results and 87 (33.0%) respondents state that universities do not identify talent of teachers. In group B universities 40 (52.6%) respondents opine that universities of group B identify talent of teachers by competencies and 15 (19.7%) respondents state that universities do not identify talent of teachers. Thus it can be observed that there are two distinct categories of respondents. One section states that talent is identified and the other states that talent is not identified by universities.

TABLE 5.3:AREAS OF SUPPORT ESSENTIAL FOR TEACHERS

H₀: There is no significance difference in the mean score of group A and group B towards rating the importance level of developmental and support activities that must be given to teachers by universities.

H₁ : There is significance difference in the mean score of group A and group B towards rating the importance level of developmental and support activities that must be given to teachers by universities.

Areas of Developmental & Support Activities	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Mann Whitney test	P-value	Result
Teaching Pedagogy	Group A	264	4.35	.60	4.00	2.31	.021	Sig
	Group B	76	4.51	.60	5.00			
	Total	340	4.39	.60	4.00			
Personality Development	Group A	264	4.20	.65	4.00	1.04	.299	NS
	Group B	76	4.24	.78	4.00			
	Total	340	4.21	.68	4.00			
Professional Growth Assistance	Group A	264	4.31	.63	4.00	1.15	.249	NS
	Group B	76	4.39	.65	4.00			
	Total	340	4.33	.63	4.00			
Publication Assistance	Group A	264	4.15	.65	4.00	.90	.369	NS
	Group B	76	4.24	.59	4.00			
	Total	340	4.17	.64	4.00			
Further Study Opportunity	Group A	264	4.12	.75	4.00	1.46	.145	NS
	Group B	76	4.26	.70	4.00			
	Total	340	4.15	.74	4.00			
Administrative Exposure	Group A	264	3.60	.93	4.00	1.12	.264	NS
	Group B	76	3.71	.98	4.00			
	Total	340	3.63	.94	4.00			
Importance of developmental activities and support	Group A	264	4.12	.46	4.17	1.60	.109	NS
	Group B	76	4.23	.44	4.17			
	Total	340	4.15	.46	4.17			

NOTE: NS= Not Significant; S= Significant

In the above table the rating of importance level of developmental and support activities that must be given to teachers by universities were analyzed. Mann Whitney test was used to test the mean scores of two groups. From the above data it can be inferred that Group A and Group B respondents differ in their opinions towards only one statement i.e on teaching pedagogy. The result for this statement is significant which means that there is a difference of opinion among the groups. The P-value for these statements is less than 0.05 and hence the null hypothesis is rejected for this statement. The results of all other statements i.e 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are not significant which means the respondents of both groups do not differ in their opinion. The P value for these

statements is greater than 0.05 and hence the null hypothesis is accepted for these statements. On the whole there is no significant difference in the opinion among the groups on the importance level with regard to the developmental and support activities that must be given to teachers by universities as the p value is $0.109 > 0.005$.

TABLE 5.4: SATISFACTION LEVEL WITH REGARD TO TALENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

H_0 : There is no significance difference in the mean score of group A and group B towards the satisfaction expressed with the TM practices followed by universities.

H_1 : There is significance difference in the mean score of group A and group B towards the satisfaction expressed with the TM practices followed by universities.

Talent Management Practices	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	Mann Whitney test	P-value	Result
Workforce Planning	Group A	264	3.57	.84	4.00	1.69	0.091	NS
	Group B	76	3.76	.81	4.00			
	Total	340	3.61	.84	4.00			
Recruitment & Selection	Group A	264	3.25	.94	3.00	4.13	0.000	HS
	Group B	76	3.79	.94	4.00			
	Total	340	3.37	.97	4.00			
Induction & Orientation	Group A	264	3.06	.92	3.00	3.57	0.000	HS
	Group B	76	3.51	.99	4.00			
	Total	340	3.16	.95	3.00			
Training & Development	Group A	264	2.99	.93	3.00	4.55	0.000	HS
	Group B	76	3.59	1.07	4.00			
	Total	340	3.13	.99	3.00			
Performance Management	Group A	264	3.07	.91	3.00	4.43	0.000	HS
	Group B	76	3.62	.82	4.00			
	Total	340	3.19	.91	3.00			
Rewards & Recognition	Group A	264	2.99	.98	3.00	4.81	0.000	HS
	Group B	76	3.64	.99	4.00			
	Total	340	3.14	1.02	3.00			
Working Conditions	Group A	264	3.33	.92	3.50	3.08	0.002	HS
	Group B	76	3.71	.91	4.00			
	Total	340	3.41	.93	4.00			
Climate & Work Culture	Group A	264	3.44	.84	4.00	1.93	0.050	S
	Group B	76	3.64	.95	4.00			
	Total	340	3.48	.87	4.00			
Overall Satisfaction	Group A	264	3.21	.66	3.25	4.62	0.000	HS
	Group B	76	3.66	.74	3.63			
	Total	340	3.31	.70	3.38			

NOTE: HS= Highly Significant; S= Significant; NS = Not Significant

In the above table the satisfaction rating on the TM practices in universities were analyzed. Mann Whitney test was used to test the mean scores of two groups. From the above data it can be inferred that Group A and Group B respondents differ in their opinions towards majority of the areas of TM. The results of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th area are highly significant which means that there is a difference of opinion among the groups. The P value for these statements is <0.001 and hence the null hypothesis is rejected for these statements.

The results of only one area is not significant which means the respondents of both groups do not differ in their opinion on workforce planning. The P value for this statement is > 0.005 and hence the null hypothesis is accepted for this statement.

On the whole there is a high significant difference in the satisfaction rating towards the TM practices followed in universities among group A and group B as the p value is $0.000 < 0.001$.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

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 findings are clear that there are significant differences between the attitudes of the respondents among the group A and group B universities with regard to the satisfaction expressed while measuring the TM practices. 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.

CONCLUSION

The TM in universities is not a façade but a fact. But when the aspect of feasibility and its implementation is questioned there are still more questions than answers. TM must be done in universities because if there is no systems approach in this segment then all the stakeholders will suffer i.e. from students to businesses will have an impact if teacher talent is not managed. Hence it is vital to incorporate the TM system in the university set up and this will have lasting impact on the economy.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Berger, L. A. & Berger, D. R. (2004): *The talent management handbook: creating organizational excellence by identifying, developing, and promoting your best people*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [2]. 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.
- [3]. 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
- [4]. DeCenzo, D. A., & Robbins, S. P. (2007). *Fundamentals of human resource management* (9th Ed) Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- [5]. Laff, M. (2006). Talent Management: From Hire to Retire. *Alexandria*. 60(11). 42-50
- [6]. Lynch, D. (2007). *Can higher education manage talent?* Retrieved June 11, 2009 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/11/27/lynch#>
- [7]. Sandler, S. (2005). The top HR issues for 2005. *HR focus*. 82(1). 12-14.
- [8]. Schweyer, A. (2004). *Talent Management Systems: Best practices in technology solutions for recruitment, retention and workforce planning*. Tri-Graphic Printing.
- [9]. Uren, L. (2007). From talent compliance to talent commitment. *Strategic HR Review*. 6(3). 32-35.
- [10]. Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). *College deans*. Westport: Oryx.