Volume and Issues Obtainable at Center for Sustainability Research and Consultancy

Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies

ISSN: 2519-089X (E): 2519-0326

Volume 6: No. 4, December 2020

Journal homepage: www.publishing.globalcsrc.org/jbsee

A Descriptive Analysis of Compensation Offerings and its Impact on Turnover Intentions of Educational Managers of Punjab

¹Majid Ali, ²Muhammad Ramzan, ³Rizwan Qaiser Danish

¹Assistant Professor, Hailey College of Commerce, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan,
majid.hcc@pu.edu.pk

²Assistant Professor, Hailey College of Commerce, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan,
wadrah1@gmail.com

³Associate Professor, Institute of Business Administration, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan,
rqdanish@hcc.edu.pk

ARTICLE DETAILS**History**

Revised format: November 2020

Available Online: December 2020

Keywords

compensation, education, offerings, intention to leave.

JEL Classification

M10, M11

ABSTRACT

This research is aimed at investigating compensation offerings at various levels and its impact on the turnover intentions of employees in educational sector of Punjab. It specifically addressed the issue how different compensation offerings (for example pay, bonus, medical facility, housing etc) effects on intention to quit from the organisation. The research has focused on gauging the impact of the compensation package on the educational managers' intention to quit, i. e. turnover, and to know to what extent degree of impact of each constituent of the compensation package has on their intention to leave the organization. This study has provided implications for policy makers in different organisations related to education particularly in Pakistani context.

© 2020 Center for Sustainability Research and Consultancy Pakistan under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike

4.0

Corresponding author's email address: majid.hcc@pu.edu.pk

Recommended citation: Ali, M., Ramzan, M. & Danish, R. Q. (2020). A Descriptive Analysis of Compensation Offerings and its Impact on Turnover Intentions of Educational Managers of Punjab. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 6(4), 1631-1651

1. Introduction

Educational sector of Pakistan is typically characterised with high turnover and teaching and non-teaching staff switch their jobs rapidly. In this way, hiring and retaining talented employees incur a huge cost. In a study by Steers, the research undertaken to understand the offerings of compensation by a company and its various elements and demonstrates that there exists a bond among the rewards a company compromises and persons individuals which are engrossed to the compensation into working for the organization, and incumbents which wanted to remain the part of business (Steers, 1991). The flourishing economy of Pakistan with a greatest extended economic expansion, specifically with the foundation of CPEC, a younger and mid-career workforce that are not old work force is increasing on regular basis and it is also evident how short joblessness is putting burden on educational industry wages while more and more PhDs and MPhils are saturating the market. Organizations and institutions in this important sector are reacting with heaps of new customized and choice based employee reward packages and benefit contributions not characteristically available from other type of firms. As a result, employees are very keen in retorting with thoughts around in which way continuum of new liaison of employee and employer must graft in the new-fangled economic conditions.

2. Significance of the Study

From a standpoint of theory, this study is an effort to provide suggestion of the financial and non-financial elements of compensation that are considered of utmost prominence to educational managers. The recent bulk of scholar's work on this area of educational management, endeavors to help further in understanding of rewards, both related financial and nonfinancial, along with their intentions to leave their jobs. This investigation also anticipates contributing to the scant studies by presenting indication of the mark to which management benefit bundles, as a whole, have an encouragement on intentions to halt with the group of universal managers. Finally, two "open ended questions" have been focused on establishing "what is the most important factor influencing a general manager's decision to stay with the company", and "what is the most important factor influencing their decision to leave". As per pragmatic approach, this research is to chart new boundaries to escort managers yearning to advance their retaining and diminish their turnover as an emblem of the useful or tolerant compensation strategies. These types of different financial and non-financial compensation plans will provide and reduce turnover.

In recent times the more focus is being paid on the employees how well they are performing in their organizations. How well an organization gears its policies and programs regarding reward system and achieves its strategic intent in terms of its mission and vision is of paramount concern. Managers are becoming increasingly aware in both private and public organizations that using an apt compensation plan a critical source of competitive advantage often comes from a suitable system of attracting and managing the organizations human resources. Hence following are the research questions and objectives of the study.

3. Research Objectives

1. To investigate the existing management reward or compensation practices of the educational managers
2. To find the relationship between compensation practices and turnover intentions in teaching and non-teaching managerial staff.
3. To identify the differences in various managerial level in compensation and turnover intentions.

4. Research Questions

The following basic research questions of this study have been described below:

1. Are the employees turnover intention decrease by the compensation plan for educational managers?
2. Among compensation essentials which in turn, as identified by different educational managers, effect turnover intentions?

5. Literature Review

5.1 Compensation

Lawler (1981) explained that total or whole compensation composed of all the benefits in cash or financial forms plus other fringe benefits which are received by employees from a company during a time is called compensation. Dibble (1999) expands the definition of earnings, "it is money even when we do not use the word" and further elaborates by stating that "a benefit like employee development, even though not necessarily viewed by the employee as compensation, is a substitute for money and a major cost for employers". In today's era, the rewards offered to employees has extended both in terms of category and quantity. Normally, a meeting is conducted after a fixed term usually one year and compensation plan is offered to managers along with annual bonus or increments based on performance considering goals for revenues and expenses of the company (Muller, 1999). In broad, compensation is categorized among two types among which one is monetary and second is non-monetary, however as the time has passed new idea of cafeteria compensation has been devised in which employees are offered a long range of benefits from which he can take whatever he wants within his limitations. Moreover, employees that have knowledge skills and abilities at their peak, they are in a better position to negotiate with the employer like a sports man. The following lists will give an overview of some of the categories and types of bonuses:

"Base Pay"

- "Salary and wages- for being at work"

“Increases for Demonstrating New Skills”

- “Competency pay”
- “Skill based pay”
- “Job progression”

“Increases for Results”

- “Incentive”
- “Commission”
- “Gainsharing”
- “Merit increase”

“Pay For Working More Hours”

- “Overtime”
- “Premium pay”

“Increases not Dependent on Anything Else”

- “Cost of living adjustment- COLA”
- “General Increase”

“Increase Based on the Organizations Financial Success”

- “Profit sharing”
- “Bonus”

“Other Forms of Increases”

- “Promotional increase”
- “Market adjustment”

“Short term incentives

- Retention bonus
- Signing bonus
- Referral bonus
- Guaranteed annual bonus
- Gainsharing
- Cash incentive programs
- Vacation awards

Long term incentives

- Stock options
- Employee stock ownership
- IPO equity
- Restrictive stock
- Manager bonus plan
- Ownership stake
- 401K plan
- Retirement plan
- Deferred compensation- 3 years or longer”

5.2 Turnover

Turnover has been defined by Mobley (1982) as “the cessation of membership in an organization by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization”. According to Wasmuth and Davis (1983), there are various schemes for categorizing employee turnover. Specifically, for this study the contrast of deliberate versus unintentional will be used since the research will focus on the employee’s intention to turnover. Voluntary turnover is the choice of employee how he wants to quit from his own will and by choice, whereas quite opposite to it is involuntary turnover which is based on the option of organization due to any reason including retirement and death (Mobley, 1982).

5.3 Intention to Turnover

In theory, a good predictor of future behavior must be a person’s behavioral intentions according to multiple research studies offered by Mobley (1982). In the previous study including intention to quit seven variables were studied as a predictor for turnover by Mobley, he concluded that when all variables were combined, “only intention to quit was significantly related to turnover”. Additionally, determined

through the other study, that intentions to leave served as a “summary variable” encompassing many other variables that were associated to turnover. The assessment by Mobley was, “intentions are the best predictors of turnover”. Intent to quit was used as a substitute for actual turnover by McFillen, Riegel and Enz because the capability to quit the job depend upon whether the employee can quit.

According to Woods (1999), the relationship changed through the process of reengineering, downsizing and reorganization when businesses decided to break the “psychological contracts” they had long held with employees, which gave employees a sense of security, in the late 1980’s and 90’s. Today we are “employed at will” Because employees are “temporary”, in the sense that mostly employees do not holds a job for whole life; Despite the certainties of the new economy still there are avoidable reasons for turnover and ways to decrease it.

Many reasons of turnover may be:

- Pay
- “Treatment by superiors”
- “Amount of work hours”
- “Job pressure”
- “Scheduling of hours - frustration with the chain”
- “Training program - slow promotions”
- “Fringe benefit package-performance expectations- poor job performance”
- “Attractive opportunity in another line of work”
- “Working manager concept- need for a new challenge- type of work required”
- “Physical demands of job”
- “Inability to live up to chain store managers image”
- “Inability to handle job”
- “Desire to get out of education business”
- “Desire to find work in another geographic area”

According to Lazear (1999) Turnover is less likely among high wage, high performing workers. Roseman states (1981), that for “more money” peoples quit the companies and “there is no question that pay rates can influence turnover however, managers generally overestimate the significance of pay”. It is sure that pay is significant, but “there are many other issues, other than pay, that effect intention to turnover. In any company, employees can compare their pay with individuals or groups internal and external to the organization. Both internal and external inequity can have dire consequences for the firm”, though the outcomes of external equity such as turnover are the most threatening according to Lawler (1981).

In the recent years another issue is planned turnover which has gained more attention. According to Lawler “not all turnover is detrimental to an organizations ability to be effective (Lawler, 1987). From losing poor performers and the inflow of “new blood” organization can benefit. When the replacement costs are negligible then it could be cost effective to agree to take a higher rate of turnover for keeping salaries repressed, and it may be the situation with unqualified labor. In additionally, when a project has a limited lifetime and the need for the employees linked with the project will come to an end” then use of planned turnover is effective.

6. Method

Data was collected through self-administered questionnaire including open ended questions from sample and population which was appropriate for this study. Unit of analysis was individual and there was minimal interference of researcher. As there were four different levels of employees, so multilevel data was analyzed to see if there is any difference among different levels.

The questionnaire with major focus on demographic variables and compensation types or offerings was distributed among the academic staff with some managerial responsibilities. Their turnover intentions were measured by one global question as whether they want to leave their job or not. We consider every person having 2 or more people under him or her to manage with. Overall 600 questionnaires were distributed among which 560 were returned filled. Among these 16 were discarded due to missing data or left-over page thus making useable response 91%.

The respondents were questioned on five point Likert scale with anchors “Not at all influential”, “Slightly Influential” “Moderately Influential” “Very Influential” and “Extremely Influential” and we analyzed it on major demographic variables, analysis of variance and correlation. The results are described in the next section.

7. Result and Analysis

Data has been analyzed through SPSS software for in depth analysis. Frequencies, mean, standard deviation, correlation, regression, and ANOVA were run for descriptive analysis and multilevel differences.

7.1 Descriptive Statistics

7.1.1 Basic Salary

Table 1. Salary of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	39	7.1	7.1	7.1
Slightly influential	59	10.8	10.8	17.9
Moderately influential	136	24.9	24.9	42.9
Very influential	181	33.2	33.2	76.0
Extremely influential	131	24.0	24.0	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 explains that out of total 546 respondents the basic salary of 39 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 59 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 136 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 181 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 131 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 7.1%, 10.8%, 24.9%, 33.2% and 24.0% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.2 Community Association/ Location

Table 2. Location of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	39	7.1	7.1	7.1
Slightly influential	76	13.9	13.9	21.1
Moderately influential	135	24.7	24.7	45.8
Very influential	202	37.0	37.0	82.8
Extremely influential	94	17.2	17.2	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 explains that out of total 546 respondents the location or community association of 39 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 76 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 135 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 202 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 94 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 7.1%, 13.9%, 24.7%, 37.0% and 17.2% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.3 Deferred compensation/ end of contract cash out

Table 3. Deferred Compensation of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	58	10.6	10.6	10.6
Slightly influential	148	27.1	27.1	37.7
Moderately influential	137	25.1	25.1	62.8
Very influential	147	26.9	26.9	89.7
Extremely influential	56	10.3	10.3	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 explains that out of total 546 respondents the deferred compensation of 58 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 148 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 137 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 147 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 56 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 10.6%, 27.1%, 25.1%, 26.29 and 10.3% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.4 Job Autonomy

Table 4. Job Autonomy of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	32	5.9	5.9	5.9
Slightly influential	71	13.0	13.0	18.9
Moderately influential	121	22.2	22.2	41.0
Very influential	239	43.8	43.8	84.8
Extremely influential	83	15.2	15.2	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.0 explains that out of total 546 respondents the job autonomy of 32 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 71 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 121 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 239 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 83 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 5.9%, 13.0%, 22.2%, 43.8 and 15.2% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.5 Job Responsibility

Table 5 Job Autonomy of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	45	8.2	8.2	8.2
Slightly influential	68	12.5	12.5	20.7
Moderately influential	112	20.5	20.5	41.2
Very influential	193	35.3	35.3	76.6
Extremely influential	128	23.4	23.4	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 explains that out of total 546 respondents the job responsibility of 45 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 68 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 112 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 193 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 128 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 8.2%, 12.5%, 20.5%, 35.3 and 23.4% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.6 Medical, Dental, Life Insurance

Table 6 Job Medical, Dental and Life Insurance of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	27	4.9	4.9	4.9
Slightly influential	60	11.0	11.0	15.9
Moderately influential	138	25.3	25.3	41.2
Very influential	214	39.2	39.2	80.4
Extremely influential	107	19.6	19.6	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 explains that out of total 546 respondents the medical dental and life insurance of 27 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 60 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 138 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 214 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 107 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 4.9%, 11.0%, 25.3%, 39.2 and 19.6% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.7 Ownership Stake/ Equity Interest

Table 7 Ownership of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	38	7.0	7.0	7.0
Slightly influential	56	10.3	10.3	17.2
Moderately influential	172	31.5	31.5	48.7
Very influential	196	35.9	35.9	84.6
Extremely influential	84	15.4	15.4	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 explains that out of total 546 respondents the ownership of 38 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 56 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 172 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 196 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 84 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 7.0%, 10.3%, 31.5%, 35.9% and 15.4% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.8 Performance Bonus

Table 8 Performance Bonus of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	30	5.5	5.5	5.5
Slightly influential	88	16.1	16.1	21.6
Moderately influential	140	25.6	25.6	47.3
Very influential	204	37.4	37.4	84.6
Extremely influential	84	15.4	15.4	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 8 explains that out of total 546 respondents the performance bonus of 30 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 88 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 140 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 204 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 84 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 5.5%, 16.1%, 25.6%, 37.4% and 15.4% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.9 Quality of Working Conditions

Table 9 Quality of working conditions of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	21	3.8	3.8	3.8
Slightly influential	37	6.8	6.8	10.6
Moderately influential	112	20.5	20.5	31.1
Very influential	247	45.2	45.2	76.4
Extremely influential	129	23.6	23.6	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 9 explains that out of total 546 respondents the quality of working conditions of 21 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 37 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 112 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 247 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 129 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 3.8%, 6.8%, 20.5%, 45.2% and 23.6% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.10 Retirement Plan

Table 10 Retirement plan of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	16	2.9	2.9	2.9
Slightly influential	40	7.3	7.3	10.3
Moderately influential	91	16.7	16.7	26.9
Very influential	226	41.4	41.4	68.3
Extremely influential	173	31.7	31.7	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 10 explains that out of total 546 respondents the retirement plan of 16 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 40 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 91 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 226 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 173 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 2.9%, 7.3%, 16.7%, 41.4% and 31.7% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.11 Status as Employer or Owner

Table 11 Status of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	16	2.9	2.9	2.9
Slightly influential	44	8.1	8.1	11.0
Moderately influential	106	19.4	19.4	30.4
Very influential	231	42.3	42.3	72.7
Extremely influential	149	27.3	27.3	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 11.0 explains that out of total 546 respondents the status as owners of 16 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 40 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 91 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 226 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 173 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 2.9%, 7.3%, 16.7%, 41.4% and 31.7% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.12 Stock Options

Table 12 Stock option of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	17	3.1	3.1	3.1
Slightly influential	51	9.3	9.3	12.5
Moderately influential	110	20.1	20.1	32.6
Very influential	236	43.2	43.2	75.8
Extremely influential	132	24.2	24.2	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 12 explains that out of total 546 respondents the stock options of 17 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 51 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 110 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 236 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 132 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 3.1%, 9.3%, 20.1%, 43.2% and 24.2% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.13 Vacation /paid time off

Table 13 Paid Time of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all influential	27	4.9	4.9	4.9
Slightly influential	35	6.4	6.4	11.4
Moderately influential	141	25.8	25.8	37.2
Very influential	218	39.9	39.9	77.1
Extremely influential	125	22.9	22.9	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 13 explains that out of total 546 respondents the vacation or paid time of 27 respondents was “Not at all influential”, 35 respondents had “Slightly Influential” salary, 141 respondents had “Moderately Influential” salary, 218 respondents has “Very Influential” salary and 125 respondents had “Extremely Influential” salary with a percentage of 4.9%, 6.4%, 25.8%, 39.9% and 22.9% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.14 Job Title of Respondents

Table 14 Job Title of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Lecturer	80	14.7	14.7	14.7
Assistant Professor	228	41.8	41.8	56.4
Associate Professor	214	39.2	39.2	95.6
Professor	24	4.4	4.4	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 14 explains that out of total 546 respondents the job title of 80 respondents was “Lecturer”, 228 respondents were “Assistant Professor” salary, 214 respondents were “Associate Professor” salary and 24 respondents were “Professor” with a percentage of 14.7%, 41.8%, 39.2% and 4.4% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.15 Marital Status

Table 15 Marital Status of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Single	313	57.3	57.3	57.3
Married	233	42.7	42.7	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 15.0 explains the marital status of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 313 were “Single” and 233 respondents were “Married” with a percentage of 57.3%, and 42.7% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.16 Total Experience

Table 16 Experience of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5 Years	361	66.1	66.1	66.1
6-10 Years	125	22.9	22.9	89.0
11-15 Years	42	7.7	7.7	96.7
16-20 Years	12	2.2	2.2	98.9
21-25 Years	6	1.1	1.1	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 16 explains the total experience of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 361 had experience of 1-5 years, 125 respondents have experience of 6-10 years, 42 respondents had experience of 11-15 years, 12 respondents had experience of 16-20 years and 6 respondents had experiences of 21-25 years respectively with percentage of 66.1%, 22.9%, 7.7%, 2.2% and 1.1% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.17 Age

Table 17 Age of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
21-30 Years	390	71.4	71.4	71.4
31-40 Years	120	22.0	22.0	93.4
41-50 Years	28	5.1	5.1	98.5
51-60 Years	8	1.5	1.5	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 explains the age of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 390 respondents belonged to 21-30 years of age, 120 respondents belonged to 31-40 years of age, 28 respondents belonged to 41-50 years of age and 8 respondents belonged to 51-60 years of age respectively with percentages of 71.4%, 22.0%, 5.1% and 1.5% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.18 Nature of Employment

Table 18 Nature of Employment of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Regular	405	74.2	74.2	74.2
Contractual	141	25.8	25.8	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 18 explains the nature of employment of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 405 were

“Regular” and 141 respondents were “Contractual” with a percentage of 74.2%, and 25.8% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.19 Education of Respondents

Table 19 Education of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Masters/MPhil	245	44.9	44.9	44.9
Doctorate	263	48.2	48.2	93.0
Others	38	7.0	7.0	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 19 explains the education of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 245 were “Master/MPhil qualified”, 263 were Doctorate and 38 respondents had other qualification with a percentage of 44.9%, and 48.2% and 7.0% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.20 Salary of Respondents

Table 20 Education of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
20000-40000	90	16.5	16.5	16.5
41000-60000	135	24.7	24.7	41.2
61000-90000	120	22.0	22.0	63.2
91000-110000	150	27.5	27.5	90.7
110000-130000	51	9.3	9.3	100.0
Total	546	100.0	100.0	

Table 20 explains the experience of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 90 had salary of 20,000 to 40,000, 135 had salary of 41,000-60,000, 120 had salary of 61,000-90,000, 150 had salary of 91,000-110,000 and 51 had salary of 110,000-130,000 with a percentage of 16.5%, 24.7%, 22.0%, 27.5% and 9.3% making it cumulative of 100.0%.

7.21 Job Status of Respondents

Table 21 Job Status of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Top Management	15	2.7	2.7	2.7
Middle Management	162	29.7	29.7	32.4
Lower Management	154	28.2	28.2	60.6
Non-Managerial	215	39.4	39.4	100.0

Total	546	100.0	100.0	
--------------	------------	--------------	--------------	--

Table 21 explains the job status of respondents that out of total 546 respondents, 12 belongs to top management, 162 belongs to middle management, 154 belongs to lower management and 215 belongs to non-managerial job with a percentage of 2.7%, 29.7%, 28.2 % and 39.4 % making it cumulative of 100.0%.

Following table describes descriptive statistics including mean standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. We can see that the retirement plan has the highest mean value, 3.92 while deferred compensation has the lowest mean value 2.99. All the standard deviations are approximately one. Skewness and kurtosis is within the threshold range.

7.22 Descriptive Analysis

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
						Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	Std. Error
Base salary	546	1	5	3.56	1.172	-.568	.105	-.451	.209
Community association/ location	546	1	5	3.43	1.140	-.493	.105	-.512	.209
Deferred compensation/	546	1	5	2.99	1.174	.004	.105	-.946	.209
Job Autonomy	546	1	5	3.49	1.081	-.634	.105	-.238	.209
Job responsibility	546	1	5	3.53	1.210	-.592	.105	-.559	.209
Medical, dental, life insurance	546	1	5	3.58	1.075	-.587	.105	-.207	.209
Ownership stake/ equity interest	546	1	5	3.42	1.085	-.507	.105	-.219	.209
Performance bonus	546	1	5	3.41	1.097	-.414	.105	-.552	.209
Quality of working conditions	546	1	5	3.78	1.006	-.862	.105	.522	.209
Retirement plan	546	1	5	3.92	1.017	-.922	.105	.444	.209
Status as employer or owner	546	1	5	3.83	1.013	-.802	.105	.242	.209
Stock options	546	1	5	3.76	1.020	-.743	.105	.106	.209
Vacation /paid time off	546	1	5	3.69	1.047	-.738	.105	.234	.209
Job Title	546	1	4	2.33	.777	-.092	.105	-.562	.209
Marital Status	546	1	2	1.43	.495	.297	.105	-1.919	.209
Total Experience	546	1	5	1.49	.818	1.903	.105	3.739	.209
Age	546	1	4	1.37	.651	1.869	.105	3.304	.209
Nature of Employment	546	1	2	1.26	.438	1.108	.105	-.776	.209
Education	546	1	3	1.62	.613	.444	.105	-.655	.209
Salary	546	1	5	2.88	1.243	-.005	.105	-1.094	.209
Job Status	546	1	4	3.04	.894	-.314	.105	-1.182	.209

The following table is about Analysis of variance that describes mean differences among variables and their relative significance. We can observe that there is no significant difference except for job autonomy and retirement plan.

7.23 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig
Base salary	Between Groups	1.560	3	.520	.377	.769
	Within Groups	746.945	542	1.378		
	Total	748.505	545			
Community association	Between Groups	5.205	3	1.735	1.338	.261
	Within Groups	702.787	542	1.297		
	Total	707.993	545			
Deferred compensation	Between Groups	3.120	3	1.040	.754	.521
	Within Groups	747.835	542	1.380		
	Total	750.954	545			
Job Autonomy	Between Groups	10.077	3	3.359	2.906	.034
	Within Groups	626.407	542	1.156		
	Total	636.484	545			
Job responsibility	Between Groups	6.763	3	2.254	1.544	.202
	Within Groups	791.143	542	1.460		
	Total	797.907	545			
Medical, life insurance	Between Groups	4.562	3	1.521	1.319	.267
	Within Groups	624.859	542	1.153		
	Total	629.421	545			
Ownership stake	Between Groups	6.183	3	2.061	1.758	.154
	Within Groups	635.239	542	1.172		
	Total	641.421	545			
Performance bonus	Between Groups	1.757	3	.586	.485	.693
	Within Groups	654.345	542	1.207		
	Total	656.103	545			
Quality of working conditions	Between Groups	7.169	3	2.390	2.379	.069
	Within Groups	544.458	542	1.005		
	Total	551.626	545			
Retirement plan	Between Groups	10.726	3	3.575	3.502	.015
	Within Groups	553.399	542	1.021		
	Total	564.125	545			
Status as employer or owner	Between Groups	6.699	3	2.233	2.191	.088
	Within Groups	552.460	542	1.019		
	Total	559.159	545			
Stock options	Between Groups	7.313	3	2.438	2.358	.071
	Within Groups	560.257	542	1.034		
	Total	567.570	545			
Vacation /paid time off	Between Groups	5.306	3	1.769	1.617	.184
	Within Groups	592.616	542	1.093		
	Total	597.921	545			

The following table describes the bivariate relationship among various variables. Most of the relationships are strong and significantly correlated, except base salary with performance bonus, community association with performance bonus. Likewise performance bonus with status as employer or owner is also insignificant.

7.24 Correlation among Variables

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Base salary (1)	1												

Community association (2)	.740**	1											
Deferred compensation (3)	-.132**	-.057	1										
Job Autonomy (4)	.563**	.622*	-.005	1									
Job responsibility (5)	.550**	.588*	.003	.625**	1								
Medical, dental, life insurance (6)	.580**	.618*	-.042	.605**	.722*	1							
Ownership stake/ equity interest (7)	.463**	.482*	-.014	.504**	.565*	.549*	1						
Performance bonus (8)	.075	.063	.313*	.067	.063	.094*	.330*	1					
Quality of working conditions (9)	.475**	.424*	-.182*	.321**	.422*	.407*	-.174*	.330*	1				
Retirement plan (10)	.398**	.405*	-.174*	.330**	.406*	.410*	.394*	-.136*	.406*	1			
Status as employer or owner (11)	.486**	.394*	-.136*	.406**	.474*	.439*	.482*	-.014	.504*	.565**	1		
Stock options (12)	.433**	.451*	-.155*	.446**	.454*	.452*	.433*	.451*	-.155*	.446**	.454*	1	
Vacation /paid time off (13)	.451**	.424*	-.113*	.456**	.417*	.442*	-.174*	.330*	.406*	.410**	.394*	-.136*	1

8. Conclusion

Basic purpose of this research was to find out how different compensation offerings affect different level of educational managers in Punjab in different universities, public as well as private sector. Specifically in this study, Base salary ,Community association/ location, Deferred compensation, Job Independence, Job obligation, Medicinal, dental, Performance bonus, Ownership stake/ equity interest, life insurance, Quality of working environments, Withdrawal plan , Position as employer or possessor, Stock choices , Holiday /salaried time off, Job Title, Marital Status, Total Experience, Age, Nature of Employment, Education, Salary and Job Status were considered as compensation which are widely used in various educational institutions.

The retirement plan has the highest mean value, 3.92 while deferred compensation has the lowest mean value 2.99. All the standard deviations are approximately one. Skewness and kurtosis is within the threshold range. The mean differences among variables and their relative significance was computed. There is no significant difference except for job autonomy and retirement plan. The bivariate relationships among various variables show that most of the relationships are strong and significant, except base salary with performance bonus, community association with performance bonus. Likewise, performance bonus with status as employer or owner is also insignificant.

However, this study is an initial step towards the attractiveness of compensation among educational managers. The longitudinal research can be conducted to find whether over the period, preferences of employees change or not. Moreover, the data was limited to Punjab based educational institutions and more data can be collected from whole Pakistan to make it more generalize. The policy makers must focus on job autonomy and retirements plans to motivate employees, specifically with greater job

experience and higher-level designations.

9. Limitations and Future Guidelines

This study is not free of limitations like other studies. The nature of the study is cross sectional while the choice of employees may change over a period. So, longitudinal study may produce different results. As the sample drawn was related to a developing country, sample from developed countries may differ in the choice of compensation offerings due to different economic conditions and cultural choices. Its generalizability may also be increased. It is recommended that future research should emphasis on the role of age, gender and culture in the compensation offerings. Executive compensation should be considered separately from general offerings. Moreover, pay for performance can be used as moderating or contingent effect to see the patterns more clearly.

References

- Dibble, Suzanne, (1999), *Keeping Your Valuable Employees*, New York, Wiley.
- Ermel, Lauren & Bohl, Don, (1997), *Responding to a Tight Labor Market: Using Incentives to Attract and Retain Workers*, Compensation and Benefits review, America Management Association International, 29 (6).
- Lawler, Edward E., (1981), *Determining Total Compensation: Strategic Issues*, Pay and Organization Development, Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley.
- Lawler, Edward E., (1987), *The Design of Effective Reward Systems*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Lazear, Edward, (1999) *Personnel Economics: Past Lessons and Future Directions*, Journal of Labor Economics, 17 (2).
- Mcfillen, James, Riegel, Carl & Enz, Cathy, (1986, Nov.), *Why restaurant managers Qui (and how to keep them)*, The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly.
- Mobley, William H., (1982), *Employee Turnover: Causes, Consequences, and Control* Reading, MA., Addison–Wesley.
- Muller, Christopher, C., (1999), *The Business of Restaurants: 2001 and Beyond*, Hospitality Management, 18 (4).
- Roseman, Edward, (1981), *Managing Employee Turnover: A Positive Approach*, New York, AMACOM.
- Steers, Richard, M., & Porter, Lyman, (1991) *Motivation and Work Behavior*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- Wasmuth, William J. & Davis, Stanley W., (1983, May), *Managing Employee Turnover: Why Employees Leave*, The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly.
- Woods, Robert H., (1999), *Predicting is Difficult, Especially About the Future: Human Resources in the New Millenium*, Hospitality Management, 18 (4).