Causes for Instructors' Intensions to Leave Public Universities in Ethiopia

Adem Kedir[1], Nigussie Dechassa[2], Behsir Shaku[3], Alebachew Abebe[4], Sitotaw Haile[5]

[1] **Arsi University, Ethiopia, email: ademkg@yahoo.com, ademkg@gmail.com**

[2,3,4,5]**Haramaya University, Ethiopia**

Abstract

Background: Staff retention has become a difficult task at public universities in Ethiopia where there is high staff turnover. Senior and seasoned teaching and research staff often leave the universities for better paying jobs in other organizations. Identifying the root causes of staff attrition at public universities in the country is a key issue for ensuring staff retention that may enable to attain sustainable expansion and quality of education and research. A focus on such issue would enable policy makers to plan strategies that would reduce attrition rate of teaching and research staff who are key role players in ensuring quality education and research at public universities in the country.

Objectives: The objective of the study was to elucidate factors that cause staff attrition at public universities in Ethiopia and suggest remedial measures.

Methods: This study was undertaken in 2013/14 academic year at 13 public (government) universities. It was undertaken through self-administered questionnaires and discussions with instructors, students, and university

leadership. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics with the support of some tests of hypothesis where comparisons were found to be necessary.

Results: The study revealed that there was low level of motivation of staff to continue working at the universities. Accordingly, 63% of the interviewed instructors responded that they had low motivation to work at the universities and 73% revealed their intention to leave their jobs in the near future. Low salaries and dissatisfaction with poor governance systems of the universities were mentioned to be the major reasons for staff to leave their jobs. The interview results also indicate that the salaries to be paid at the universities in the study year should be 19,641.89 (Nineteen Thousand and six hundred and forty-one and 89 cents) for a person with the academic rank of professor, for example. The salary issue is, however, resolved in 2016 to the extent that is equivalent to the recommendation of this study.

Recommendations: Recommended solutions include installing staff benefits beyond salary and improving the working environment for the staff, including good governance. It is important also to make further study in order to see the effect of policy lag and make necessary adjustments.

Keywords: Instructors; motivation; salary, governance; Staff attrition; Staff retention

1. **Introduction**

Universities in Ethiopia have the triple mandates of teaching, research, and community engagement. They are also supposed to be the engine of societal transformation through technology and knowledge generation and dissemination.

Human power is a key for performances of universities in all fields of endeavor. Dedicated and creative work of teaching and research staff members is central to the attainment of the missions of universities. Therefore, the universities in Ethiopia need to establish the critical mass of teaching and research staff members to attain their goals. However, retaining staff particularly those experienced ones has become a major problem at public universities in Ethiopia. According to Hanna and Lucie (2011), employee turnover has many undesirable effects such as the failure to use expertise and experiences gained by a leaving employee, development of unwanted features and approaches in other employees in the organization, disruption of attitudes to work and morale; and increase of costs to recruit replacement. Staff are often reported to leave universities in search of better paying jobs in other organizations within the country or abroad as mentioned in different forums in which universities meet. Staff intention to stay at or leave a university depends on a number of motivating or de-motivating factors.

Motivation refers to the process that accounts for an individual's willingness to exert high levels of effort to attain an organization's goals, conditioned by effort's ability to satisfy some individual needs (Robbins and Coulter, 2005). According to Robbins and Coutler (2005), theories give different factors for staff motivation. The three-need theory, for example, states that three major motives to work are need for achievement, need for power, and need for affiliation. On the other hand, the goal-setting theory has the proposition that specific goals increase performance and that difficult goal when accepted result in higher performance than easy goals. The expectation theory states that an individual tends to act in a certain way based on the expectation that

the act will be followed by a given outcome and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual.

The equity theory has the proposition that an employee compares his/her job's input-outcome ratio with that of relevant others and then correct any inequality. Hughes et al. (2006) puts this in a mathematical form as

$$\frac{personal\ outcomes}{personal\ inputs} = \frac{reference\ group\ outcome}{reference\ group\ input}$$

For example, an instructor in a university may compare what he earns in return of his effort in teaching and doing research in his university with what his friend earns by putting some effort in another organization, say sugar corporation or even a university. If this ratio is less than the equivalent ration of his friend, he is motivated to leave the university.

Empirical studies give different reasons for employee turnover. Bawa and Jantan (2005), for example, state that staffing process and employee monitoring are effective in reducing voluntary turnover and economic factors such as availability of alternative jobs are the most likely relevant variables in explaining the staff turnover process. Hanna and Lucie (2011) summarizes factors affecting staff turnover in seven groups under the assumption that personal reasons such as moving, starting a family, illness, retirement or restarting studies are not taken into account.

These seven factors are:
1. Low pay (remuneration, benefits, imbalance between performance and reward)

2. Future certainty (trust in the company's vision, following business ethics, trust in leaders/management, new project s and innovations, speed of employee turnover, a vision of the future)

3. Relationship at work place (co-operation, treatment, fairness, tolerance, helpfulness, the style of assigning and performing tasks)

4. Roles and positions (recognition) in the organization (prestige, opportunities, development, recognition)

5. Communication within the organization and its level (type, feedback, concealing of information, respecting opinions)

6. Organizational culture (workload, flexible working hours, access to sources, type of culture, focus on quality) and

7. The expectation (imbalance between work and personal life, unclear assignments, expectations),

These factors were found to be statistically significant in determining employee turnover, according to the authors. Our current study has used these concepts and other found in the literature, in the questionnaire in order to get staff feedback

Evidence from Haramaya University's (our initial objective was to study about Haramaya only) Human Resource Management and Development show that about 134 academic staff members left the university in the 2012/13 academic year alone. When this attrition is seen in terms of academic rank, 72 were lecturers, 20 were assistant lecturers, 20 were graduate assistants, and 10 were assistant/associate professors. This implies that 61% of the staff members who left the university was the ones on whom the university invested a lot of resources on their education. The turnover of graduate assistants and assistant lecturers (30%) also implies the existence of some problems even in retaining junior and inexperienced staff members.

The Institute of Technology, College of Medical and Health Sciences, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, and College of Business and Economics share 38, 32, 16 and 14 of the staff attrition. Staff attrition in the aforementioned colleges indicates existence of serious threat to the government's effort to meet its development goals, especially its growth and transformation plan.

Except the above-mentioned one year-staff attrition data that we obtained from the Human Resource Management and Development Office of the Haramaya University, no information was available on staff attrition rate as well its causes. This study was designed to fill such a research gap. In addition, no empirical evidence was available on staff attrition and the reasons thereof at other public universities in the country. Therefore, we selected 14 public universities (the report covers only 13 universities) in the country to conduct the study. The universities were selected purposively considering their varied geographical location in reference to the distance from the capital, Addis Ababa as well as based on their varied years of establishment. The main objective of the study was to elucidate the level of staff retention and mobility with their major causes.

2. Methodology

This study was aimed at investigating the major causes/correlates of staff turnover in purposively selected Ethiopian public universities and come up with possible solutions for the identified problems. Such objectives need both official data and responses from concerned staff. The staff included those who were working at the universities during survey time (active employees)

as well as those who left the universities for various reasons. The study design is, therefore, explained as follows.

2.1. Data and the Methods of Data Collection

Based on the literature reviewed in the background, the variables that are supposed to affect staff turnover are (1). University environment- which include administrative support in assigning duties and work load, entry, stay and leave procedures, staff involvement in university affairs and (2). The employee characteristics- which include gender, culture, ability and performance in teaching/research/community services, psychological factors, etc. Data were also collected on the demand-supply nature of the specific fields of study. The secondary data included the number of staff who left the particular university by education level, field of study, type of termination and years. The data collection questionnaire was designed based on the general scientific literature as well as the contents of the Higher Education Proclamation (No. 650/2009) of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. It was tested at Haramaya University on departments that were not part of the survey.

In article 7 of the Higher Education Proclamation (No. 650/2009), it is stipulated that the guiding values of higher education institutions are 1) pursuit of truth and freedom of expression of truth; 2) institutional reputability based on successful execution of mission; 3) competitiveness in scholarship and cooperation with other institutions; 4) institutional autonomy with accountability; 5) participatory governance and rule of law; 6) justice and fairness; 7) a culture of fighting corruption; 8) quality and speedy service delivery; 9) economical use of resources and effective maintenance of assets; 10) recognition of merit; and 11) democracy and multiculturalism. The same proclamation also clarifies the rights and the responsibilities of

academic staff members in its articles 31 and 32. The way these values are exercised directly or indirectly affects university staff retention. Hence, some of the questions in the questionnaire emanated from these values.

The selection of the universities was based on geographical location, years of establishment, distance from the country's capital, environmental setting (urban/rural). Accordingly, fourteen universities were selected as shown in Table 1.

Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs and/or directors/heads of Human Resources Management of the respective universities were contacted in order to get the general idea of the colleges/schools from which instructors leave most frequently. Colleges/schools, from which instructors leave more frequently as well as those from which they leave less frequently, were selected for the study. The colleges/schools helped us in identifying the relevant departments in the same way.

Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs, directors/heads of Human Resources Management, college/faculty deans, department/school heads were included in the interview. Graduating class students (from the selected department were also interviewed to share their experiences about staff turnover in the last three to seven years. Five hundred seven (507) instructors filled the questionnaire that deals with the intention to leave and other issues related to instructor's turnover and work at the respective university. This paper is based on the findings from 13 universities only since one out of the 14 universities refused to give us permission to conduct the interview. The results and discussions also focused on the responses of the instructors as they are the main stakeholders on which the study was proposed. It was not possible to interview staff who had already left the universities since we

could not trace them easily. The scope of this study is, thus, limited to active staff members.

2.2. The Methods of Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Responses were put in percentages and means of quantitative values. Although regression analysis is commonly used in identifying the determinants of an outcome variable, we opted to use descriptive statistics as the instructors themselves told us why they wanted to leave their universities. That means we may not need probability models in case the causes are deterministic at least by asking the respondent. Inferential statistics like chi-square test of association and t- test were also applied to test the degree of association between two qualitative variables and to test the significant differences between groups or between observed values and expected values.

Table 1: Selected Universities by region and special characteristics

S. N	University	Region	Special characteristics
1	Haramaya	Oromia	Rural, remote, old
2	Jimma	Oromia	Urban, remote, old
3	Maddawalabu	Oromia	Urban, remote, new, cold
4	Wollega	Oromia	Urban, remote, new
5	Adama	Oromia	Urban, old, center
6	Samara	Afar	Rural, remote, new, hot
7	Bahir Dar	Amhara	Urban, remote, old
8	Wollo	Amhara	Urban, remote, new
9	Hawassa	South	Urban, old, hot
10	Arbaminch	South	Urban, remote, old, hot
11	Mekelle	Tigray	Urban, remote, old
12	Adigrat	Tigray	Urban, remote, new
13	Addis Ababa	A.A	Urban, central, old
14	Gondar	Amhara	Urban, remote, old

Note: Remoteness refers to the distance from Addis Ababa, the capital of the country.

3. Results and Discussion.

Data were collected from 507 (male= 474, female=33) university instructors, of the 13 universities (able 2). About 38% of the instructors reported that they were married, whereas 62% reported that they were single. The average family size of the staff was three. The average age of the instructors was 29.64 years. About 68.5% of the instructors were Master's degree holders, 25.5% were first degree holders, 5.8% were degree PhD, and 0.2% had specialty certificates. Accordingly, 67.7% were lecturers, 8.3% were Assistant Professor and above, and the remaining were either graduate assistants or assistant lecturers. Among the instructors, 43.1% were assigned to work at the universities by the Ministry of Education (MOE), 45.4% were employed directly by the universities, 8.3% were transferred from other universities and others joined the current universities from non-teaching organizations. Out of the 507 instructors 61.4% lived in rented houses while 23.7% lived in university apartments outside the university, and only 11.3% lived in university apartment on the campuses of the universities. Payment of housing allowance was reported to be associated with problems related to staff attrition by all those who live in the rented houses. The instructors reported that the current housing allowance level did not allow them to rent a decent house let alone a standard one. It was also found that only 2.8% of the instructors lived in their own houses.

Asked about their friends who left their universities, the instructors blamed low salaries and lack of other financial incentives, lack of facilities (housing, office, and laboratory facilities), lack of good governance, family problem, and less attractive working environment for leaving their jobs at the universities. Those who had already left the universities could not be traced because of lack of information about their whereabouts.

Table 2: Number of instructors interviewed by university

Name of university	Number of instructors
Addis Ababa University	32
Bahir Dar University	35
Gondar University	53
Mekelle University	27
Adigrat University	34
Wollo University	42
Samara University	40
Adama University	28
Jimma University	36
Maddawalabu University	34
Hawasa University	37
Haramaya University	71
Arba Minch University	38
Total	507

The instructors were also asked about their own motivation and intention to continue working at the universities. Nearly **63**% of them indicated that they were not at all motivated to continue working at the universities. This indicates that attaining the missions of the universities is under threat since more than 60% of the staff is not motivated to continue working.

Considering the way through which the staff joined the universities, 47% of those directly employed by the universities reported to be motivated to continue working. On the other hand, 28.6% of staff directly recruited and assigned by Ministry of Education to work at the universities reported that they were motivated to continue working. Those who were directly recruited by the universities as well as those who were relocated from other organizations cited disillusionment as the major de-motivating factor to continue working. Instructors who were directly recruited and assigned by

the Ministry of Education claimed that the distant location from their birth places as well as unpleasant weather conditions were the major de-motivating factors. In private, some instructors stated that the desire to study for higher degrees was their only motivation to be employed by public universities.   The contractual agreement they enter with the universities as well as the subsequent holding of their degrees until they would serve for the stipulated years of service after a postgraduate study was described to be a de-motivating factor.

Table 3: Association between the motivation at the current university and the way the instructor joined the university (chi square=21.476, p=0.000)

		How did you join at the University?					Total
		Employed by the University	Transferred from other University	Assigned by ministry of education	Transferred/left from other non-teaching organization	Others	
Are you motivated to work at the current University?	Yes	105 (47%)	11 (37.9%)	61(28.6%)	1 (11.1%)	4 (57.1%)	182 (37%)
	No	118	29	152	8	3	310
Total		223	40	213	9	7	492

Similarly, 73% of the instructors had the intention to leave their universities at any time in the future. When seen from the perspective of the way instructors joined the universities, 81% of those who were directly assigned by the Ministry of Education expressed the intention to leave soon while about 66% of those who were directly employed by the universities had also the intention to leave in the ~~near~~ future. In this regard, the majority of the instructors had the intention to leave irrespective of the way they joined the universities although the figure is high for those who were assigned by the Ministry of Education.

The reasons indicated by the instructors for their intentions to leave the universities are ranked and given in Table 4. Low salary and lack of other financial incentives and bureaucratic administrative systems were found to be the most important causes for the intention to leave the universities. We also came across 35 instructors who expressed de-motivation to continue working at the universities, but said that they did not have immediate intentions to leave the universities. The majority of them stressed that they would not leave their universities since it's located in the midst of their birth places and will rather strive to work hard to contribute to the betterment of the life of the future generation in the area. One of the instructor said, "I will serve my country in the same university hoping changes will come in the future".

Table 4: Reasons for instructors' intention to leave their universities

Reason for the intention to leave	Number of instructors	% who agree to the reason	Type of problem
1. Lack of financial incentives outside salary	353	90.3	Income
2. Low salary	355	87.9	Income
3. Lack of value/rewards/appreciation/recognition to my works or performance	342	76.9	Income, admin
4. Lack of opportunities for part time work	348	72.1	Income
5. Lack of timely responses to my requests	337	68.3	Admin
6. Congested office spaces, lack of office facilities	349	68.2	Admin
7. Lack of positive responses to my requests	342	66.4	Admin
8. Lack of organs to handle complaints	330	65.7	Admin
9. My expectations have not been met	335	65.4	Income, admin
10. Lack of participation in decision making	340	60.9	Admin
11. Absence of fringe benefits	310	60.6	Income
12. Lack of academic freedom	348	56.0	Admin
13. Because social status of teachers is quite low	343	55.4	Social, political
14. Lack of participation in university affairs	342	55.3	Admin
15. Unfairness in assignments	336	54.3	Admin

16. Unfair selection and recruitment procedures	335	50.2	Admin
17. Discrimination in selection for future studies	334	47.6	Admin
18. Fear of retribution when I comment on required changes	327	45	Admin
19. Unfairness in granting promotions	322	41.9	Admin
20. I am unable to publish research paper as required	333	38.7	Personal
21. Because of my family related problem	331	36.0	Personal
22. Unfavorable weather condition	340	34.7	Environment
23. Because I do not like the style/personality of my boss	331	23.9	Admin
24. Difficulty to work with pears (co-workers)	329	23.7	Environment
25. Lack of good school for the education of my children	321	19.0	Environment
26. Because of my health problem	331	18.8	Personal
27. Unable to follow organization timing, rules and regulation	327	17.7	Admin
28. Because some friends/relatives are changing jobs	333	12.0	Environment
29. Because of fun	316	10.1	Personal
30. Because teaching is a difficult job	327	8.0	Personal

Similarly, we came across 94 instructors who expressed the intention to leave the universities even though they were motivated to work. Despite having motivation to work, most of these instructors resented the state of working in a locality very far away from their and their relatives' domicile.

As the main stakeholder, instructors gave a number of recommendations for change to attract and retain staffs. The need to increase salaries was the foremost t recommendation. Accordingly, they recommended minimum salaries under 2013/14 market conditions (Table 6) which is 19,641.89, 16,165.40, 13,458.92, 10,517.47, 7,385.26 and 5,477.09 Birr for Full Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Assistant lecturer, and Graduate Assistant, respectively. Instructors also recommended

that the 35% taxation imposed their salaries as well as honoraria, etc. for part time work has to be reduced. They also suggested that the minimum wage or salary on which tax must be imposed should be raised beyond the current one which 150 Birr. Changing that level at least to the current new minimum 615 Birr may reduce some economic burden for employees. What is called maximum salary, which is Birr 5000, has also been changed. Hence, the salary level for 35% tax must be re-fixed.

Before we finalized writing this report, the government announced a new salary scale for all government employees. The government action is appreciable as it answers one of the greatest questions of instructors working at universities. In the announcement, the government said that it utilized its maximum financial capacity in fixing the new salary scale. The results indicated in Table 6 show, however, that the instructors' expectation is significantly more than the salary increments made. This may be because of policy lags. The government promised to assist its employees through other incentive mechanisms. As researchers, we displayed the differences between the salary increment and the expectations by instructors according to this study. A study is also required to assess the current market situation and re-fix the salary that goes with the market at least for some five years.

Table 5: Association between the intention to leave and the way the instructor joins the university (chi- square=12.542, p=0.014)

		How did you join at the University?					
		Employed by the University	Transferred from other University	Assigned by ministry of education	Transferred/ left from other non-teaching organization	Others	Total
Do you have the intention to leave the University?	Yes	145 (65.9%)	30 (73.2%)	170 (80.6%)	6 (66.7%)	6 (85.7%)	357(73.2%)
	No	75	11	41	3	1	131
Total		220	41	211	9	7	488

The instructors also suggested the following to be fulfilled in order to curb attrition

1. Providing a competitive housing allowance and making it free of tax;

2. Providing transport facilities for staff on their daily routines in nearby market and towns;

3. Providing staff with opportunities for part time work;

4. Providing houses on campuses;

5. Providing decent school for staff children;

6. Providing loans for staff to own/buy cars;

7. Providing staff with land and loans to build own houses;

8. Placing the right persons in right university positions based on merit and competence only;

9. Providing staff with lap tops, scanners, and other amenities;

10. Rewarding good performances and holding people accountable for bad performances (Institute reward and punish systems);

11. Providing good infrastructure at work places;

12. Providing decent staff lounges and catering services for staff;

13. Provide staff with improved education and research grant opportunities;

14. Providing staff with health insurance;

15. Reduction in the amount of tax imposed on staff (for example 35%) to 2% for part time income after working for own and other organizations;

16. Establish strong links with overseas universities for collaborations in teaching, research, and community engagement;

18. Salaries of fresh Master/PhD graduate and those who have experiences should not be the same even if there is no change in the rank;

19. Recruiting many local staff rather than paying lots of money for employing expatriate staff with foreigners of equal or lower status and

19. Assigning staff to universities based on their choices and interests.

The staff strongly urged promotion of good governance at the universities. They recommended the following in this respect.

1. All university positions, including the presidents, should be filled based on merit rather than by political affiliations or loyalty.

2. They urged also the availability of people on managerial positions at offices for services instead of frequent meetings and travels; and top university management should treat all colleges, schools and departments in fair and similar manners.

3. Capacity building training for both university management and the staff; avoiding religious, ethnicity, birth place and other biases/discrimination by the university management at different levels in assignments, education opportunities, promotion, research grant and other areas in the university system were also other important recommendation given by them.

4. They continued recommending clear government and university strategies supported by research evidence; cultures of transparency

and accountability where the staff can express their own ideas without fear and retribution/revenge; ensuring rule of law; and the distribution of burdens and benefits among all in order to avoid exploitation.

5. Flexible management that has the ability to understand and interpret laws, rules and regulations in the country and the university was also another important recommendation by the instructors.

6. The other recommendations include assigning competent anticorruption commissioners, who are free of religious and ethnic bias/discrimination, not corrupt themselves and who are independent of university management and different and fair rules and regulations for staff and students where the staff resides in the campus.

7. It was also suggested that instructors should not be forced to serve double of the years they studied for masters/PhD as being practiced in some universities.

8. Studying while serving the universities, studying abroad, studying in local universities, and studying in own university all should have different waits in contractual agreements for future services required of the staff who gets study leave opportunities.

Table 6: New minimum salary recommended by the instructors against the old and new government salary levels, by academic rank

Academic Rank	Recommendation by instructors			Old salary (B)	New salary increased by the government (C)	Difference (C-A)
	Number of respondents	Mean minimum expected salary (A)	Std. Deviation			
Technical Assistant	274	3,842.35 (211.62%)	1,724.104	1233	1663 (34.87%)	-2,179.35
Graduate Assistant	311	5,477.09 (143.43%)	2,261.108	2250	3145 (39.78%)	-2,332.09
Assistant Lecturer	310	7,385.26 (93.33%)	3,186.827	3820	5077 (32.91%)	-2,308.26
Lecturer	403	10,517.47 (128.39%)	5,727.007	4605	7286 (58.22%)	-3,231.47
Assistant Professor	305	13,458.92 (147.25%)	6,741.488	5443	8847 (62.54%)	-4,611.92
Associate Professor	296	16,165.40 (154.69%)	9,009.388	6347	10790 (70%)	-5,375.40
Professor	296	19,641.89 (168%)	11,082.969	7329	13468 (83.76%)	-6,173.89

Note: The difference is statistically significant at α=0.01.

9. Instructors suggested also that the service the staff gave before going for further study should also be counted in the agreement to be fair between the staff and the organization as some staff gets the opportunity after serving for longer time than required.

There was also another salary change made in 2016. The paired t-test result shows that there is no significant difference between this new salary and the recommendation of the staff. This result also indicates that our study's prediction is nearly perfect.

Table 7: Comparison of staff proposal and the 2016 new salary

Rank	GA I	Assistant Lecturer	Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Proposal	5447.09	7385.26	10517.47	13458.92	16165	19641.89
2016 new	5178	8310	10470	13140	16360	20245
Difference	-269.01	924.79	-47.47	-318.92	195.00	603.11
Test value	$t= 0.893, p=0.413$					

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the finding of the study, the following conclusions are made.

1. About 61% of university staff, on average, lives in a rented house but the housing allowance is insufficient under the prevailing market prices.

2. About 70% of academic staff, on average, has no other means of earning income other than the basic monthly salary.

3. About 63% of academic staff in the studied universities, on average, is not motivated to work at their universities.

4. On average, 73% of the instructors in the universities have the intention to leave their universities in any time in the future.

5. Low salary, absence of other sources of income beyond salary, and lack of good governance at different management levels in the universities were among the major causes of staff turnover.

6. The instructors who work in the universities nearest to their birth places do not have the intentions to leave even if they are not motivated. They want to struggle to bring changes rather than escaping.

7. Instructors' minimum salaries at 2013/14 market conditions to be 19641.89, 16165.40, 13458.92, 10517.47, 7385.26 and 5477.09 birr for full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer, assistant lecturer and graduate positions, respectively. The salary adjustment made by the government some weeks after our data collection but before our data analysis falls significantly below these recommend levels. The salary adjustment made in 2016 nearly matches this recommendation, except that there may be problem in time value of money and policy lag.

8. The culture of exit interviews is low in many places either because of lack of awareness of its benefits, lack of attention to the institutional development or for fear of inability to answer what the staff could raise in the process of the interview.

9. University physical environment is also one of the causes of instructors' turnover in some universities.

10. Staff raise the tax rate and its fairness when working for own university and when working for other universities. They consider it best to work for other universities whenever there is part-time work as they are taxed 35% when working for own university but 2% for other universities.

Based on these major conclusions and other findings discussed in the text, the following recommendations are given.

1. Improving salary levels based on the suggestions of the staff and adjusting it to the prevailing market conditions is important. There must be some sort of optimization between the instructors' recommendations and the government made salary adjustments. As there are a few full professors in the country, for example, it is possible to raise their salaries even more than what the staff recommended so that people work towards achieving such higher levels. The benefit gained by doing so is by far more than the cost incurred by paying such a salary. The salaries of other levels can be adjusted accordingly in such a way that instructors are motivated to work and other are also motivated in joining university teaching positions.

2. The tax levels should change with salary adjustments made and to be made by studying its impact on the motivation to work and country's investment.

3. Instructors have to be given houses in the campus or paid the allowance that is sufficient for renting houses in the prevailing market conditions.

4. Government has to install system of good governance in its universities and monitor the implementation of the same. Assigning visionary leaders to universities can also help in this regard. Complete homogeneity of people from the same religion and/or from the same birth place or relatives in university management positions should be minimized to avoid discriminations.

5. The universities have to make their university physical environment comfortable for life. Offices, class rooms, cafeteria, residence houses, toilets, residence houses and laboratories are those facilities which the universities can change themselves.

6. Creating opportunities of double employment and encouraging staff to work/ be transferred in the areas of their interests can also reduce staff turnover a lot.

7. Universities regulations concerning staff rights to further education, promotion, transfer, research, and other should be clear and consistent. Decisions should not be based on the personal judgments as judgments change when the persons change.

8. Instructors, themselves, also to upgrade their statuses by participating in research, publication and consultancy works. The most competent the instructors will be the better the opportunity to bring changes in the universities.

5. References

Bawa, M. A and Jantan, M. (2005). Human Resource Practices As Determinants of Employee Turnover: An Empirical Investigation, *Asian Academy of Management Journal, 10 (2), 69-89*

Hana, U and Lucie, L (2011). Staff Turnover as a Possible Threat to Knowledge Loss, *Journal of Competitiveness, 3, 84-98*

Hughes, R.L; Ginnett, R.C and Curphy, G. J (2006).***Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience,*** 5[th]ed, Tata McGraw, New Delhi

Robbins, S. P and Coulter, M (2006).**Management**, 8th ed., Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi