

Impact of COVID-19 on higher education, Challenges, turn over and stress drivers: A study w.r.t. Bengaluru Urban

Banashankaravva, A. H

M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer, Department of Sociology Government PU College Hosakote, Bangalore Rural District, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Rethinking on higher education has become essential on account of changes brought by Covid-19. Rewriting of education norms has become a necessity. The process of assessment also requires a serious thought. Indian higher education system needs a through overhaul since the existing system of education is suffering from serious setbacks. Today majority of developing countries are under great pressure to restrain public spend on higher education. The structural adjustment program favoured by IMF and World Bank stress decrease on public expenditure, mainly due to deficit budgets and external debt.

Uptil early nineties higher education was publicly funded by central and state governments. But after 1991 the governmental policies dramatically undergone changes. The government began to talk of remaining public support to higher education and makes it self financing due to emphasis has to be given on primary education (Rani, 2011). Indian higher education system is the thrid largest in the world, next to USA and China. As per 2011 census about 8.15% (68 million) of Indians are graduated (Rukmini S. 2015). Indian higher education system expanded at a fast rate by adding nearly 20000 colleges and 8 million students in a decade from 2000-01 to 2010-11 (Dr. Education.com 2020). As of 2020 India has over 1000 universities with a break up of 50 central universities, 334 private univerities, institutes under legislature Act, and 155 institutions of National importance which includes IIMS, IITS etc (Private Universities, 2011).

The growing Indian economy requires educated skilled labour force. To meet this requirement private enterprises have cropped upto complement public educational institutions since these are suffering from capacity constraints. In fact over the past a few decades, private sector has really driven capacity creation in Indian higher education (Anand Sundersham et. al. 2012).

KEYWORDS : Self financing, private, higher education, public expenditure, constraints, tradition, teacher, salary, stress.

Introduction:

Higher education is an ancient tradition. The earliest global popular university known as Takshashila in 7th Century BC had scholars not only from India but all parts of the world (Shanthi 2008). Education is a power tool that leverages country's progress and lifts our masses from misery of poverty and ignorance. The quality of higher education despite quantity mismatch is a constant worry to the planners and

administrators. Developed nations have achieved 55% enrolment of eligible groups in higher education where as in India it is 11% (Mungekar, 2018).

Education acts as catalyst in transforming human beings into human resources (Gopalan, 2001). Education is considered as one of the important instruments for the development of any country. Higher education encompasses research, teaching, and training (Sobfi 2010). Teachers assist strong and excellent workforce in any country (Bidisha Lakkar et al. 2015). They share their knowledge, expertise, intellect and experience to build good contributing human beings to the society. Teachers assist in building up a strong human resources base of a country. With the growing demand of quality teachers the educational institutes started to retain the best teachers. Greenberg and Baran (2003) conducted a survey which states that every people want to be satisfied with their jobs. Job satisfaction makes the work pleasant and enjoyable which is very important for both the job and the employee (Bidisha Lehkar Das et al. 2015). Teachers nurture the competitiveness of future leadership and develop children and youths to be good human being in the society. The role played by teachers in developing students successfully to carry out different responsibilities for social, economic and political development of the country. Against this background this paper highlights the impact of Covid-19 on the life of teachers, institutions and students, challenges faced stress undergone by teachers in the field and reasons behind quittals.

Review of literature

Wefald et al. (2008) reveals that they found in their study a direct relationship found between work load a direct relationship stress and turn over intentions.

Yahaya et al. (2009) stated that absence of proper supervision and appropriate support from the authority towards accomplishment of assigned tasks will be instrumental in causing high storages and intentions to leave.

McNall et al. (2010) expressed that flexible work arrangements had a drastic effect on turn over intentions in different organisations.

Faisal Mahmud et al. (2015) stated that in their study that all independent variables i.e., salary income, supervisor behaviour and work load have a positive correlation with depended variable i.e., job satisfaction. It means that if salary is raised job satisfaction will be increased. Further the researchers said that job satisfaction is directly related with employee turn over so that it can be said that all the independent variables have a positive correlation with employee turn over.

The study by Sandya et al. (2016) states that some factors are responsible for adversely affecting employee retention. The authors have receipted that those factors may be salary, experience, work location preference, appreciation of the employee suggestion and their involvement in the policy making which the long run produce a eternal relationship with the employee institution.

Melissa Wahe Manogharam et al. (2018) have said academic staff are one of the most prominent people in private higher institution. The well equipment of students with knowledge and skill required for them to be awarded with diploma or degree certificates is completely in the hands of academic staff. The self financing institutions should focus on few aspects of academic such as research, publication

projects and other elements apart from the core lecturing task that directly related to the academic path way.

Objectives

- (1) To analyse the demographic profile of teachers of different colleges.
- (2) To analyse the impact of Covid-19 on higher education.
- (3) To analyse the challenges faced in the higher education.
- (4) To study the causes behind turn over and stress drivers.

Hypotheses

- (1) The demographic profile of respondents is not supporting the study.
- (2) Covid-19 has not impacted higher education.
- (3) There are no challenges faced.
- (4) There are no reasons behind turn over and here are no stress drivers.

Limitations

- (1) The study is only confined to Bengaluru Urban.
- (2) Data collection was little difficult on account of frequent lockdowns and seal downing and due to long spell of holidays the collection of data become little easy.
- (3) Any generalisation requires further in depth of data.

Research Methodology

Questionnaire was divided into two major sections. The first was concerned with personal information about age and gender. Second section is concerned about information about Covid-19 impact on higher education, challenges faced, turn over and stress drivers. Nominal scale used to label variables without providing any quantitative value and the second section was presented by using ordinal scale in which the variables are measured on specific numerical scores or values with equal distances between attributes.

Universe - The present study is confined to Bengaluru Urban area. A sample of 200 covering different colleges has been covered.

Sources of data - The present study considers both primary and secondary data. Data on impact of Covid-19 and challenges faced, stress factors, causes behind teacher turn over has been collected through a well drafted questionnaire in English. Secondary data compiled from journals, university news letters and websites.

Tools used - The different opinions expressed by the respondents are placed in 3 point Likert scale and then the data was tabulated. ANOVA test is performed to measure good fit of data and variation.

Sample, sampling techniques and sample structure - 200 sample considered sufficient due to lock downs and sealdown of areas in Bengaluru. Convenient sampling techniques was adopted to collect the data. 200 college teachers were approached for the purpose.

Data collection - The teaching faculty was requested to provide data and questionnaire was circulated among the teachers. In some cases questionnaire was uploaded to the e-mails and request was made to complete the questionnaire and to return. Mobile helped to remind the teachers to said as early as possible.

Data analysis and presentation

Table -1 highlights about demographic profile of respondents. 55% are males and the rest 45% are females. The female participation in the profession is interestingly growing over the years. Further the table reflects that most of the respondents belong to the age group of 15-25 reflecting most of the teachers are youngsters and at the start of their career. The lowest number belongs to the age group of above 45 years. In some institutions it was found that retired professors are now doing private job. 50% of the sample are working in permanently unaided institutions followed by 20% in private aided institutions and 15% each in private universities and deemed colleges.

Table - 2 reveals data on descriptive variations and ANOVA test reveals very interesting information. Impact of COVID-19 is measured and shown in the table. The impact is measured through the statements 5 that vary from quittals to spread of fear. Variation analysis reveals that 110 respondents expressed strongly agree followed by 65 agree and 25 somewhat disagree. ANOVA fails to accept H0 and accepts H1 revealing presence of significant variations in the data.

Table - 3 Presents information about challenges of higher education faced at Bengaluru urban. There are 7 statements highlights about the challenges. Variation analysis reveals that 116 stated strongly agree followed by 63 agree and 21 some what agree . ANOVA fails to accept H0 and accepts H1 and it is concluded about the presence of significant variation in the data.

Table - 4 highlights data on reasons behind turn over through 6 statements varying from job dissatisfaction quittals to personal factors. Variation analysis reveals that 116 respondents felt strongly agree followed by 60 agree and 24 some what disagree. ANOVA tools to accept H0 and accept H1 and it is concluded that there exist significant variation in the data.

Table - 5 reveals data about stress drivers. 6 statements reveal about the stress drivers. Variation analysis reveals that 120 respondents felt strongly agree followed by 62 agree and 18 some what disagree. ANOVA fails to accept H0 and accepts H1 and it is concluded by stating that there exist significant variation in the data.

Conclusion

Higher education institutions are catalysts in producing skillful and knowledgeable human resource force. The problem that confront Indian higher education today over low rates of enrolments, unequal access and poor quality of infrastructures and lack of relevance. Result from the analysis show that Covid-19 has affected severely the higher education system, and faculty members expressed about turn over and stress factors. Retention of qualitative teachers is absolutely necessary in the interest of students growth and production of qualitative labour force. The study confirms that independent variables impacted very much teacher turn over, and severe stress drivers. From all this discussion it can be concluded that organisations should be more vigilant with faculty regarding sales, working hours, hours of stay and should try to retain the best faculty since private higher education scenario with more number of universities is getting public support and has a better future.

Table - 1 : Demographic profile of respondents

| A. Gender | No. of respondents | % |
|--|--------------------|------|
| Males | 110 | 55 |
| Females | 90 | 45 |
| Total | 200 | 100 |
| B. Age (in years) | | |
| 15 - 25 | 95 | 47.5 |
| 26 - 35 | 70 | 35.0 |
| 36 - 45 | 20 | 10.0 |
| >45 | 15 | 7.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100 |
| C. Sample Category | | |
| Private aided institutions | 40 | 20 |
| Permanently unaided private institutions | 100 | 50 |
| Private universities | 30 | 15 |
| Deemed (Universities) Colleges | 30 | 15 |
| Total | 200 | 100 |

Source : Field Survey

Table - 2 : Impact of Covid-19 on higher education

| Impact of Covid-19 | SA | A | SWDA | T |
|--|-----|----|------|-----|
| Heavy quittals of teachers on account of nonpayment of salaries | 30 | 16 | 4 | 50 |
| Surge in the unemployment | 24 | 15 | 6 | 45 |
| Postponement of the reopen of institutions | 23 | 10 | 5 | 38 |
| Online classes not beneficial to one and all and do not contribute to build social capital | 18 | 15 | 4 | 37 |
| Spread of fear among the students | 15 | 9 | 6 | 30 |
| Total | 110 | 65 | 25 | 200 |

Source : Field Survey

Note : SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, SWDA - Somewhat Disagree

Hypotheses

| | | |
|----|--|--------|
| H0 | There exist no significant variation in the data | Reject |
| H1 | There exist significant variation in the data | Accept |

ANOVA Table

| Source of Variation | SS | d.f. | MS | F-ratio | 5% F-limit (from the F-table) |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Between sample | 723.3335 | (3-1)=2 | 723.3335/2 = 361.6668 | 361.6668/15 = 24.1111 | |
| Within sample | 180.0000 | (15-3)=12 | 180/12 =15 | | (2,12) =3.88 |

Total 903.3335 (15-1)=14

Source : Field Survey

ANOVA Analysis

The calculated value being 24.1111 higher than the TV = 3.88 @ 5% level of significance with $df = V1 = 2$, and $V2 = 12$ fails to accept H_0 and accepts H_1 . Therefore it is concluded here that there exist significant variation in the data.

Table - 3 : Challenges of higher education

| Type of challenges | SA | ASWDA | T | |
|---|-----|-------|----|-----|
| Poor infrastructure | 25 | 14 | 4 | 43 |
| Inadequate and unqualified, untrained faculty | 18 | 9 | 1 | 28 |
| Overload in curriculum and imbalanced | 15 | 5 | 2 | 22 |
| Lack of financial resources | 13 | 9 | 3 | 25 |
| Ineffective monitoring | 10 | 6 | 2 | 18 |
| Poor government funding | 15 | 8 | 4 | 27 |
| Neglecting innovation and research | 20 | 12 | 5 | 37 |
| Total | 116 | 63 | 21 | 200 |

Source : Field Survey

Note : SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, SWDA - Somewhat Disagree

Hypotheses

| | | |
|-------|--|--------|
| H_0 | There exist no significant variation in the data | Reject |
| H_1 | There exist significant variation in the data | Accept |

ANOVA Table

| Source of | SS | d.f. | MS | F-ratio | 5% F-limit |
|----------------|----------|-----------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Variation | | | | | (from the F-table) |
| Between sample | 647.7831 | (3-1)=2 | 647.3831/2 = 323.69155 | 323.69155/12.0952 = 26.76 | |
| Within sample | 217.7143 | (21-3)=18 | 217.7143./18 =12.0952 | | (2,18) =3.55 |
| Total | 665.0974 | (21-1)=20 | | | |

Source : Field Survey

ANOVA Analysis

The calculated value being 26.76 higher than the TV = 3.55 @ 5% level of significance with $df = V1 = 2$, and $V2 = 18$ fails to accept H_0 and accepts H_1 . Therefore it is concluded here that there exist significant variation in the data.

Table - 4 : Causes behind high turn over

| Drivers of faculty turn over | SA | A | SWDA | T |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Job dissatisfaction and quittals | 22 | 12 | 4 | 38 |
| Unrealistic expectation by management | 25 | 8 | 4 | 37 |
| Better pay & prospects elsewhere | 15 | 14 | 6 | 35 |
| Organisation culture | 16 | 7 | 3 | 26 |
| Low salary, harassment and unsuitable working counters | 26 | 13 | 5 | 44 |
| Personal factors | 12 | 6 | 2 | 20 |
| Total | 116 | 60 | 24 | 200 |

Source : Field Survey

Note : SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, SWDA - Somewhat Disagree

Hypotheses

| | | |
|----|--|--------|
| H0 | There exist no significant variation in the data | Reject |
| H1 | There exist significant variation in the data | Accept |

ANOVA Table

| Source of Variation | SS | d.f. | MS | F-ratio | 5% F-limit |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Between sample | 833.3958 | (3-1)=2 | 833.3958/2 = 416.6979 | 416.6979/31.5689 = 13.199 | (from the F-table) |
| Within sample | 473.5329 | (18-3)=15 | 473.5329/15 =31.5689 | | (2,15) =3.68 |
| Total | 1306.9287 | (18-1)=17 | | | |

Source : Field Survey

ANOVA Analysis

The calculated value being 13.199 higher than the TV = 3.68 @ 5% level of significance with df = V1 = 2, and V2 = 15 fails to accept H0 and accepts H1. Therefore it is concluded here that there exist significant variation in the data.

Table - 5 : Factors driving stress among faculty

| Stress drivers | SA | A | SWDA | T |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Poor physical conditions | 25 | 12 | 5 | 42 |
| Time pressure & heavy work load | 18 | 8 | 2 | 28 |
| Lack of job security | 25 | 14 | 5 | 44 |
| Poor relation with the management | 16 | 9 | 3 | 28 |
| Lack of effective consultancy | 15 | 8 | 2 | 25 |
| Financial difficulties emerged on account of changed style of living | 21 | 11 | 1 | 33 |
| Total | 120 | 62 | 18 | 200 |

Source : Field Survey

Note : SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, SWDA - Somewhat Dis Agree

Hypotheses

| | | |
|----|--|--------|
| H0 | There exist no significant variation in the data | Reject |
| H1 | There exist significant variation in the data | Accept |

ANOVA Table

| Source of Variation | SS | d.f. | MS | F-ratio | 5% F-limit |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Between sample | 872.4756 | (3-1)=2 | 872.4756/2 = 436.2378 | 436.2378/9.289 = 46.96 | (from the F-table) |
| Within sample | 139.3334 | (18-3)=15 | 139.3334/15 =9.289 | | (2,15) =3.68 |
| Total | 1011.8090 | (18-1)=17 | | | |

Source : Field Survey

ANOVA Analysis

The calculated value being 49.96 higher than the TV = 3.68 @ 5% level of significance with df = V1 = 2, and V2 = 15 fails to accept H0 and accepts H1. Therefore it is concluded here that there exist significant variation in the data.

References:

Anand Sudarshan., and Sandya Subramanian. (2012) **Indian Infrastructure Report**, 2012. No. 16, P. 172-184.

Bidisha Lakhar Das., and Mukulesh Baruah. (2015). An empirical study on teacher retention in Guwahati City. **International Journal of business management and measurement invention**, 4(7), 1-9.

Gopalan, K. (2001). **Higher education in India prospects and perspectives in reforms and innovations in higher education**, Zeenat,S. & Safi C. (Editor), Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi, P. 3.

Latest statistics on Higher Education (2020). Dr. Education. Com, 17th July 2020.

McNall, L.A., Masuda, A.D., and Nicklin, J. M. (2010). Flexible work arrangements, job satisfaction and turn over intentions: The meditating role of work to faulty enrichment. **Journal of psychology**, 144: 65-81 DOI.10.1080/oo223980903356073.

Melissa Vane Manghanam., Tuivaharan., and Radziah Abd Rahman. (2018) Academic Staff retention in private higher education institute. Case study of private colleges in Kuala Lumpur, **International journal of Higher education**, 7(3), 52(1).

Mungekar, B. L. (2008). Reforming and restructuring India’s higher education, **University News**, 40 (9), 12-18.

Private Universities - UGC (2011). UGC.ac.in 1st August 2011. Retrived on 17th July 2020.

Rani, G. (2011). Economic Reforms and Financing Higher Education in India. <http://www.aiiserver.com/glf/wp>

Sandya., and Kumar., (2016). Employees retention by motivation, Indian journal of science and technology (electronic), 4(12), 1778, 1782.

Shanthi, K. (2008). Issues and challenges in higher education. **University News**, 46 (38). P. 18.

Sobli, R. C. (2010). Governance in higher education: International Scenario. **University News**, 48(45) Nov. 8-14, 2010.

Wefald, A.J., Smith M.R., Savatsano, FC., & Downey, R. G. (2008). **A structural model of workland, job attitudes, stress and turn over intentions**, Kansas State University.

Yahaya, A., Yahaya, N., Arshad, K., Ismail, J., and Jalam, S. (2009). Occupational stress and its effects towards the organisation managements. **Journal of Social Science**, 5: 390-397. DOI: 10-3844/jssp.2009.390.397