Administrative Support and Academic Staff Turnover Intentions in Teacher Training Colleges in Kenya

Sarah Likoko[1] , Jane Alunga[2]

Department of Educational Planning and Management, Kibabii University

Abstract— The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of administrative staff and academic staff turnover intentions in teacher training colleges. The study employed ex post facto research design. Purposive sampling was used to select 4 public teacher training colleges, 4 college principals and 8 senior masters. Simple random sampling was used to select 430 academic staff members for the study. Data was collected using a questionnaire which had closed-ended (Likert type scale 1-5) questions. College principals and senior masters were interviewed in order to get in-depth information on administrative support and turnover intentions among the academic staff. The data was analyzed using Pearson correlation and simple linear regression analysis. The study established that administrative support had a significant negative influence on the turnover intentions amongst academic staff in the public teacher training colleges.

1. INTRODUCTION

The provision of administrative support to an employee is likely to generate feelings of goodwill towards the organization, strengthening the bond between employer and employee, which, in turn, increases the feelings of obligation to repay the organization, through the norm of reciprocity (Tuzun &Kalemci, 2011). Thus, when employees believe that they are being supported by the employers, they reciprocate by having lower turnover intentions (Zafar, 2015; Nasrin, 2011 ;). Therefore the current study sought to establish if there exist a similar scenario among the academic staff and managers in teachers colleges in Kenya.

Umamaheswari and Krishnan (2015) analyzed the factors influencing employees' continuation in ceramic manufacturing industries.A questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents. Respondents were asked to respond the questionnaire on a Likert- scale range from *1- 5 with 1 = strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree*. Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) has been employed for analyzing the collected data. The result derived from the data collected predicted that supervisor support acts as a predominant factor having significance over employee retention which coincides the previous research studies (Umamaheswari & Krishnan, 2014). The

results could not be generalized as Umamaheswari and Krishnan (2015) employed one tool in data collection, however to make the results more reliable, the present study employed more than one tool in data collection.

Fairly recent study by Jugurnath, Bhewa and Ramen (2016) evaluated the impact of employee satisfaction and retention in the health services in Mauritius. A total of 65 respondents were selected for this study, using the census sampling technique. Primary data was collected by the means of a structured questionnaire where closed ended, open ended and Likert scale were set. Descriptive statistics were used to show the findings from the questionnaire and also SPSS 21 was used to correlate employee's satisfaction and employee's retention. The results shows that there is a positive relationship between supervisor support and employee satisfaction, which at the end contribute significantly to employee retention. However, Jugurnath, Bhewa and Ramen (2016) used a small sample of 65 respondents with one research tool in data collection. This may pose limitation in term of generalizability. To fill the gap, there was need to increase sample representativeness and a variety of research instruments to yield a more reliable and accurate data.

Nichols, Swanberg and Bright (2016) found that turnover intentions were lower for workers who reported greater levels of supervisor support among frontline Hospital workers in USA. By surveying 270 housekeeping and dietary service workers employed at 2 US hospitals, this study examined the relationship between supervisor support and turnover intent and assessed the mediating role of affective commitment between supervisor support and intent to turnover. However, Nichols, Swanberg and Bright (2016) study used convenience sampling method which is highly vulnerable to selection bias and influences beyond the control of the researcher which can lead to high level of sampling error. Therefore, there was need to pursue these relationship using different sampling methods to authenticate the results.

Moreover, Ngigi and Orodho (2016) examined determinants of job satisfaction and retention of special education teachers in primary schools in Nairobi County in Kenya. A descriptive survey research design was applied. A sample size of 75 participated in the study. Mixed method involving qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to generate data. The study concluded that teachers who teach in special education institutions do not receive the expected support to deal with the wide range of learners with special needs. However generalization of results could be done with a lot of caution since special needs schools operate in a different situations and environment from main stream learning institutions. To fill the gap, the current study sought to investigate the influence of administrative support on turnover intentions among the academic staff in teacher training colleges in Kenya.

Similarly, Zafar (2015) aimed to study how employees regard importance of their supervisory support toward their retention. Quantitative data was collected using the non-probability self-administered questionnaire that consist of questions with 5-points Likert scales distributed to our samples of 42 individuals. According to the result of the study supervisory support has a significant positive association with employee retention with $R = 0.84$ and $p = 0.00$ that means the supervisory support contributes more than 84% employee

retention. It means that as one variable increases in value, the second variable also increase in value. The main limitation of Zafar (2015) was that representativeness of the sample was relatively small, which could have an impact on statistical reference and test power. Therefore, this may pose limitation in terms of generalizability. To fill the gap, the participants in the current study were well distributed to guarantee the sample's representativeness.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

2.1 Administrative Support and Turnover Intentions among the Academic Staff

To measure the administrative support accorded the academic staff in teacher training colleges, a multi-item five-point likert scale was used. Respondents were asked to rate on the scale their level of agreement with the various items indicating the extent to which the administration supports them. Their responses were analyzed using the weighted averages and are shown in Table 1

Table 1: Administrative Support among the Academic Staff

Administrative Support	SA	A	U	D	SD	$\sum f_i$	$\dfrac{\sum f_i w_i}{\sum f_i}$
I am happy with cooperation I receive from the management team.	34	105	71	82	84	376	2.80
Management has provided support and established environment of trust to academic staff	40	80	85	98	73	376	2.78
I am satisfied with care I receive from my senior master(s).	0	109	137	130	0	376	2.94
I have the opportunity to interact with management above my immediate supervisor	0	126	123	127	0	376	3.00
I am satisfied with support I get from college administrators.	33	99	123	67	54	376	2.97
I am happy with support I receive from administrators.	43	101	92	101	39	376	3.02
Administrative behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging	37	89	108	102	40	376	2.95
The administration does a good job of getting resources for this institution	98	118	71	66	23	376	3.54
Cumulative Frequency						**3008**	**24.00**

Source :Field Data(2017)

In response to the question that they were happy with the cooperation they receive from college management team, one hundred sixty six (44.1%) of the respondents disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale) as compared to 139 representing 37.0% who agreed (scores 4 and 5 on the scale). With a weighted average of 2.80, the results suggest that on the average, the academic staff in teacher training colleges indicated, were uncertain on whether they were happy with the cooperation they receive from the college management team. This implies that there was average cooperation received by the academic staff from the management teams.

To the assertion that management provided support and established environment of trust to the academic staff, 171 respondents representing 45.5% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale) as compared to 120 representing 31.9% who agreed. Eighty five respondents representing 22.6% were uncertain. Since less than half of the respondents either disagreed, the study results indicate that the management fairly supports and has established an environment of trust.

On whether they were satisfied with care they receive from their immediate supervisor(s), 130 respondents representing 34.6% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale) as compared to 109 representing 29.0% who agreed (score 4 and 5 on the scale). One hundred and thirty seven respondents representing 36.4% were uncertain. Since majority of the respondents were uncertain, the study results indicate that the care the academic staff receive from their immediate supervisor(s) was average. This is supported by the weighted average of 2.94 which indicates 'unsure'.

To answer the question on whether they had the opportunity to interact with management above their immediate supervisor, 127 respondents representing 33.8% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale) while 126 representing 33.5% who agreed (score 4 and 5 on the scale). 123 respondents representing 32.7% were uncertain. Since there was almost an equal number of those who agreed as those who agreed, the study results indicate that the interaction with management above their immediate supervisor was average. This is supported by the weighted average of 3.00 which indicates 'unsure'.

In response to the assertion that the academic staff are satisfied with the support they get from school administrators, 121 respondents representing 32.2% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale), 132 representing 35.1% agreed (score 4 and 5 on the scale) while 32.7% were uncertain. Since less than 50% of the academic staff agreed, the results indicate that that the academic staff might not be satisfied with the support they get from the school administrators.

To deal with the issues of college administration's, whether supportive and encouraging to the academic staff, 140 respondents representing 37.2% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale), 144 representing 38.3% agreed (score 4 and 5 on the scale) while 24.5% were uncertain. The results indicate that the college administration's behavior toward the staff is not adequately supportive and encouraging.

In this question, the researcher sought to get the respondents views about administration in provision of resources, 142 respondents representing 37.8% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale), 126 representing 33.5% agreed (score 4 and 5 on the scale) while 28.7% were uncertain. The results indicate average rating of the job done by the administration in getting teaching and learning resources to the college to aid the academic staff in their work.

Lastly, the researcher sought to understand the respondents opinion on whether the evaluation of the academic staff performance was fairly carried outs, 89 respondents representing 23.7% disagreed (score 1 and 2 on the scale), 216 representing 57.4% agreed (score 4 and 5 on the scale) while 18.9% were uncertain. The results indicate average rating of the college administration's evaluation of the academic staff performance was perceived to be fair. This can be associated with the structured performance appraisal system provided by the employer which involves evaluation by immediate supervisors based on the performance targets sets by the academic staff.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Aggregated Variables (N=376)

	N	Min.	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Administrative Support(X_3)	376	9.00	45.00	32.3404	9.26994

Source: Field Data(2017)

The results presented in Table 2 shows that administrative support had a mean index of 32.3404 with responses deviating from this mean by a standard margin of 9.26994. The mean was slightly above 27 hence it could be inferred that administrative support in teacher training colleges was rated favourably.

2.3. Simple Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Turnover Intentions and Administrative assistance

The multiple regression model is presented as follows:

$$Y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1(X_3)$$

where:- Y is the dependent variable, which is the turnover intention

$X_3 -$is the administration support index

$\alpha_0, \alpha_1,$ are the regression coefficients

ϵ is the error term

To assess the amount of variation in turnover intent that can be explained by changes in the independent variables (administration support) the coefficient of a correlation and the coefficient of determination were used. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 3: Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std.Error of the Estimate
1	.713[a]	.508	.504	1.46089

a. Predictors: (Constant), Remuneration Practices, College leadership and Administrative Support
b. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intent
Source: Field Data (2017)

The results displayed in Table 3 indicate that the coefficient of multiple correlations, R was 0.713 which indicates a very strong correlation between the independent variables and turnover intent. Since R^2 ranges from 0% -100%, 50.8% shows the model fits these

data, implying that 50.8% of the variation in turnover intent for the sample of 376 the academic staff in teacher training college can be explained by the changes in administration support, while 49.2% remains unexplained.

In assessing whether the model can significantly predict the turnover intention of the academic staff, the *F*-statistic from the ANOVA was used and the results are presented in Table 4. The results reveals that the independent variables: administration support can significantly predict the turnover intent of the academic staff in colleges/ (F (3,375) = 128.016, $p < 0.05$).

Table 4: ANOVA[a]

Model		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
1	Regression	819.633	3	273.211	128.016	.000[b]
	Residual	793.918	372	2.134		
	Total	1613.551	375			

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intent
b. Predictors: (Constant), Administrative Support, Leadership, Remuneration.
Source: Field Data (2017)

In assessing the significance of the multiple regression coefficients in the model, the *t*-test for regression coefficients and the standardized beta values were used. The unstandardized beta coefficients were used as the regression model coefficients. In assessing the significance of the simple regression coefficients in the model, the *t*-test for regression coefficients and the standardized beta values were used. The unstandardized regression coefficients, the standardized beta coefficients and *t*-test values are presented in Table 5

Table 5: Regression Coefficients (N=376)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	19.064	.299		63.860	.000
	X_3	-.068	.011	-.302	-6.073	.000
	X_4	-.067	.016	-.204	-4.096	.000
	X_5	-.098	.017	-.313	-5.963	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intentions
Source: Field Data (2017)

Based on the unstandardized coefficients presented in Table 5, the regression model for the relationship between turnover intentions and working conditions is therefore;

$$Y = 19.064 - 0.068X_3 - 0.067X_4 - 0.098X_5$$

Where; Y is the turnover intent, 19.419 is the constant i.e. the intention to leave without the influence of the independent variables. The results indicate a negative relationship between turnover intent and administration support, as indicated by the negative regression coefficients of $\alpha_1 = -0.068, \alpha_2 = -0.067, \alpha_3 = -0.098$ respectively.

To test for the statistical significance of the regression coefficients, the *t*-test together with the *p*-values were used as indicated in Table 5. In testing the significance of the administrative support (X_3) coefficient, a *t*-test value of -6.073 was obtained with the *p*-value of 0.000 obtained which is less than the 0.05 level of significance.

To measure the effect size of the independent variables the standardized beta coefficients were used as presented in Table 5. Consequently, the results in Table 5 depicted that administrative support has the an effect size of -0.302, which implies that a unit increase in the administrative support, holding the other factors constant could result in a 30.2% decrease in turnover intentions amongst the academic staff teacher training college.

Regression analysis results presented in Table 5 indicate that administrative support ($\alpha_1 = -0.068, p < 0.05$), contributed significantly to turnover intentions. The researcher therefore, rejected the null hypothesis, (Ho) that, 'administrative support have no statistically significant influence on turnover intentions among the academic staff in teacher training colleges in Kenya'. This implies that administrative support had a statistically significant influence on turnover intentions among the academic staff in colleges. The findings are in line with the interview data. During the interviews with the senior masters, it was alluded that supportive behavior from managers led to reduced turnover intentions among the academic staff. The findings presented in Table 5 agree with Corda and Murtokangas (2016) who found that administrative support was significant predictors of turnover intentions among the teachers in selected Swedish schools. Although, Corda and Murtokangas (2016) supported the current study, the main limitation is related to the fact that the research was conducted in one small municipality in Sweden. Further, since their study was qualitative research, the results could not be verified objectively against the scenarios stated by the respondents. In this regard, the researcher found it difficult to generalize the results to other learning institutions in other countries.

Moreover, the results presented in Table 5 of the study indicated strong support for the notion of job embeddness theory. More specifically, organizational sacrifice is considered as the perceived psychological benefits that may be forfeited by leaving a job among employees (Mitchell *et al.*, 2001). This probably means that, the academic staff who leaves, may have to give up cherished administrative support offered by the superiors in the colleges. If this case could be true, then academic staff who considers quitting but does not want to sacrifice valued relationship and benefits from the superiors and organization at large, then would be less likely to terminate employment.

3. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that the academic staff who were well supported by the college administration had little intentions to leave.

REFERENCES

Jugurnath. B., Bhewa. C., & Ramen. M.(2016). "Employee Satisfaction and Retention in Health Services: Empirical Evidence at the ENT Hospital Mauritius". Proceedings of the Fifth Asia Pacific Conference on Global Business, Economics. *Finance and Social Sciences* (AP16Mauritius Conference)ISBN - 978-1-943579-38-9 Ebene-Mauritius, 21-23 January,2016. Paper ID: M622

Nichols, H. M., Swanberg, J. E., & Bright, C. L.(2016). Does Supervisor Support Influence Turnover Intent Among Frontline Hospital Workers?The Mediating Role of Affective Commitment. *The Health Care Manager*, Volume 35, Number 3, pp. 266–279

Tuzun,I. K., & Kalemci, R. A. (2011). Organizational and supervisory support in relation to employee turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 27*(5), 518-534. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941211235418

Umamaheswari, S. &Krishnan, J.(2015).Retention Factors and Their Relative Significance in Ceramic Manufacturing Industries in India. *Asian Social Science*; Vol. 11, No. 13; 2015. ISSN 1911-2017 E-ISSN 1911-2025. doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n13p260

Zafar, A.(2015). The Consequences of Supervisory Support on Employee Retention in Rawalpindi, Pakistan. *Developing Country Studies*,Vol.5, No.13, 2015 ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565. www.iiste.org