

*Attrition Attitude of Employees in
IT and ITES Industry*

CHAPTER VI

**ATTRITION ATTITUDE OF EMPLOYEES IN
IT AND ITES INDUSTRY**

Attrition refers to the loss of employees due to reasons other than termination. Companies incur huge cost in recruiting the new employees, spend a lot of money to train them and when they leave the organisation for specific reasons, it becomes a great loss for the organisation on account of employee attrition. An employer has no direct control over how many personnel are lost due to employee attrition. The causes of employee attrition includes , due to illness, conflict, work-life imbalance, feeling undervalued, inadequate skill, lack of promotion opportunities and in general not being happy with the firm. The attitude of employees in the work environment will have greater impact on the organisation as a whole. Attrition attitude refers to an employee’s negative opinion towards organisation loyalty and support of the management, for the purpose of analyzing attrition attitude in IT and ITES industry.

6.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS- ATTRITION ATTITUDE

The employees of the organisation have been asked to express the opinion regarding Attrition Attitude on 5 point scale. The scales includes strongly agree to strongly disagree. The Attrition Attitude scale includes 35 statements. The higher rating shows more agreeability to the particular statement. The descriptive statistics and mean rating for statement have been depicted in the following table.

Table 6.1 Descriptive Statistics-Attrition Attitude

S.No	Attrition Attitude	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
1	Lack of integration and goal setting.	400	1.00	5.00	3.8875	.97067
2	Lack of scientific goal setting process causes high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7000	.87574
3	Lack of integration of people in the organization leads to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6175	.93455
4	Social isolation is a major cause for high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	2.3525	1.10965

S.No	Attrition Attitude	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
5	I feel that I get self-respect and dignity in this organization.	400	1.00	5.00	2.2400	1.09791
6	Sleeping disorders causes high employee attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	2.1300	.93557
7	“Work from home option” will reduce high employee attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	2.2750	.90356
8	This organization’s infrastructure is good and makes my work easier.	400	1.00	5.00	2.2075	.95221
9	Lack of safe and good transportation facility leads to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	2.3450	.92092
10	This organization’s location is good and it makes my work easier.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7100	.95298
11	This organization provides sufficient holidays for employees.	400	1.00	5.00	2.5425	1.14956
12	This organization conduct stress reduction programs like yoga, meditation etc.	400	1.00	5.00	2.7925	1.20544
13	I believe that the organization’s leadership is doing what is required for its growth.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5125	.89266
14	Absence of performance-based bonus causes high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4825	1.10578
15	Low perceived equity of rewards	400	1.00	5.00	3.6350	1.09991
16	I am paid enough for the work I do	400	1.00	5.00	2.5475	1.17950
17	This organization do not provide welfare measures like housing schemes, health club etc.	400	1.00	5.00	2.8100	1.25612
18	Odd working hours causes high employee attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7625	.98921
19	Lack of talent management in the organization leads to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7500	.91903
20	Absence of counseling and medical health checkups causes high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5450	.99016
21	Lack of spiritual sessions organized in this organization leads to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3875	1.11824
22	This organization does not conduct effective motivational programs.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4650	.99813

S.No	Attrition Attitude	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
23	This organization has high standards of corporate governance.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7275	.89176
24	Lengthy working hours leads to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5000	1.04534
25	My organization provides hygiene and timely food to the employees.	400	1.00	5.00	2.4775	.94165
26	Salary hike in every six months can be a better option to reduce high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	2.4775	.95749
27	Constant pull of higher salaries	400	1.00	5.00	3.7075	.91872
28	Reward systems in this organization are not transparent.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7525	1.01677
29	Introduction of family benefit plans will reduce high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5475	1.10263
30	The culture of this organization is such that it creates a very positive work environment.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5225	1.16958
31	Lack of communication around total value causes high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6650	.86582
32	Lack of work value and ethics causes high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6700	1.00679
33	Internal job rotation will lead to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6900	.98046
34	Eye fatigue and vision deterioration leads to high attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5550	.99723
35	Mismatching of job expectations creates the problem of attrition.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6550	.97125

Source-Primary Data

It is seen from the above table that the ratings of the respondents vary from a minimum of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to a maximum of 5 (Strongly Agree) for all the statements. The highest mean rating is 3.8875 for the statement ‘Lack of integration and goal setting’. That is on average the opinion of the respondents (employees) with respect to this statement fall within the agreeability level of Agree (4) and Strongly Agree(5). The lowest mean rating is 2.1300 for the statement “Sleeping disorders causes high employee attrition”. That is the agreeability level for this statement ranged between Neutral (3) and Agree(4). The table shows that for most of the statements the mean

ratings are above 3 and below 4. That is, the agreeability level of the respondents fall between 'Neutral' and 'Agree' for most of the statements. To sum up, the opinion of the respondents regarding Attrition Attitude majorly fall between 'Neutral' and 'Agree'.

6.2 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ATTRITION ATTITUDE

The scales for Attrition Attitude consisted of 35 items and have been analysed to extract the underlying dimensions in the Attrition Attitude scale. The results of factor analysis are given below.

Table 6.2

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.837
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7608.705
	Df	595
	Sig.	**

KMO and Bartlett's test are the two tests which test for the adequacy of the sample to conduct the factor analysis. The KMO measure being 0.837 (should be above 0.5 at least) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity significant at 1% level indicates the data are more appropriate for factor analysis.

Step 2

Principal Components Analysis (PCA) is used to extract factors. As mentioned earlier, PCA is a method used to transform a set of correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables (here factors) so that the factors are unrelated and the variables selected for each factor are related. Next PCA is used to extract the no. of factors required to represent the data. given below.

The scale consisted of 35 items (variables) each with a variance of 1 then the total variability that can potentially be extracted is equal to 35 times 1. The following table gives the variance accounted for by the successive factors.

Table 6.3**Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Rotated)		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	9.441	26.974	26.974	4.242	12.120	12.120
2	2.939	8.396	35.370	3.026	8.645	20.765
3	2.597	7.420	42.790	2.768	7.909	28.675
4	2.056	5.875	48.665	2.743	7.838	36.513
5	1.810	5.171	53.836	2.702	7.719	44.232
6	1.605	4.586	58.422	2.612	7.462	51.694
7	1.442	4.119	62.541	2.303	6.580	58.274
8	1.088	3.109	65.650	1.875	5.358	63.632
9	1.032	2.949	68.599	1.738	4.967	68.599
10	.963	2.753	71.352			
11	.907	2.591	73.943			
12	.817	2.335	76.278			
13	.715	2.042	78.319			
14	.636	1.818	80.137			
15	.598	1.709	81.846			
16	.564	1.613	83.459			
17	.515	1.471	84.929			
18	.513	1.465	86.394			
19	.466	1.332	87.726			
20	.453	1.295	89.020			
21	.391	1.116	90.137			
22	.359	1.026	91.162			
23	.339	.967	92.130			
24	.324	.925	93.055			
25	.306	.874	93.930			
26	.296	.846	94.776			

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Rotated)		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
27	.278	.795	95.571			
28	.242	.691	96.262			
29	.238	.680	96.943			
30	.222	.634	97.577			
31	.201	.573	98.150			
32	.188	.538	98.687			
33	.174	.497	99.185			
34	.147	.421	99.605			
35	.138	.395	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From the table given above, in the second column we find the variance on the new factors that were successively extracted. In the third column, these values are expressed as a percent of the total variance. Factor 1 accounts for about 27 percent of the total variance, factor 2 about 8 percent, and so on. As expected, the sum of the eigen values is equal to the number of variables. The third column contains the cumulative variance extracted. The variances extracted by the factors are called the *eigen values*. We can retain only 9 factors since the eigen values greater than 1. The total variance explained by the 9 factor model in the original set of variables is (68.60%).

The table shown below gives the Component Matrix or Factor Matrix where PCA extracted 9 factors. These are all coefficients used to express a standardized variable in terms of the factors. These coefficients are called factor loadings, since they indicate how much weight is assigned to each factor. Factors with large coefficients (in absolute value) for a variable are closely related to that variable. For example, Factor 1 is the factor with largest loading (-0.664) for the item, namely **“My organization provides hygiene and timely food to the employees”**. These are all the correlations between the factors and the variables, Hence, the correlation between this Statement and Factor 1 is -0.664. Thus the factor matrix is obtained. These are the initially obtained estimates of factors.

Table 6.4**Component Matrix**

Statements	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
My organization provides hygiene and timely food to the employees.	-.664	.132	.087	.205	.126	-.054	.097	.079	-.237
Lack of talent management in the organization leads to high attrition.	.633	.234	-.016	-.258	.044	-.021	-.206	.125	.131
The culture of this organization is such that it creates a very positive work environment.	.619	.237	-.243	.351	.161	.054	-.196	-.180	-.002
This organization does not conduct effective motivational programs.	.615	.199	-.365	-.077	-.181	-.048	-.093	.161	-.069
I believe that the organization's leadership is doing what is required for its growth.	.609	.134	.151	.080	.055	.117	.069	.031	-.190
"Work from home option" will reduce high employee attrition.	-.599	.333	-.224	.011	.137	.253	.249	-.034	.108
Internal job rotation will lead to high attrition.	.590	.450	.231	-.041	.097	-.005	-.197	-.088	.059
This organization do not provide welfare measures like housing schemes, health club etc.	-.588	.289	.420	-.180	.270	.026	-.153	.073	-.172
This organization has high standards of corporate governance.	.587	.229	.199	-.273	-.121	-.026	-.186	.035	.010
Odd working hours causes high employee attrition.	.563	.162	.067	.115	-.517	-.058	.200	.119	.235
Mismatching of job expectations creates the problem of attrition.	.556	.480	-.093	-.257	.010	.094	-.164	.025	.136
Lack of integration of people in the organization leads to high attrition.	.551	-.367	.145	.392	.179	.141	.001	.190	.155
I feel that I get self-respect and dignity in this organization.	-.547	.441	.026	-.025	-.380	.331	.051	-.193	.053
Sleeping disorders causes high employee attrition.	-.542	-.056	-.390	-.057	.364	.179	.293	-.217	.116
Eye fatigue and vision deterioration leads to high attrition.	.528	.403	.048	-.007	-.265	.273	.163	.171	.033
I am paid enough for the work I do	-.525	.418	.189	.145	.158	.162	-.218	.137	.008
Lack of work value and ethics causes high attrition.	.521	.408	.182	.197	.310	-.290	-.107	-.122	-.058

Statements	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
This organization's location is good and it makes my work easier.	.518	-.363	.261	-.221	-.164	.229	.078	-.243	.014
Salary hike in every six months can be a better option to reduce high attrition.	-.515	.208	-.021	.392	-.301	.116	-.141	.300	-.245
Introduction of family benefit plans will reduce high attrition.	.498	.290	-.225	.469	-.161	.077	-.081	-.143	.088
Absence of performance-based bonus causes high attrition.	.479	-.171	.124	.313	-.167	-.374	.416	-.230	-.057
Lack of safe and good transportation facility leads to high attrition.	-.476	.222	-.231	.276	-.062	-.429	.102	.195	.298
Lengthy working hours leads to high attrition.	.476	-.082	.157	-.009	-.102	-.238	.298	.357	.125
This organization's infrastructure is good and makes my work easier.	-.474	.356	-.384	.288	.177	-.088	.207	.090	.244
Lack of scientific goal setting process causes high attrition.	.464	-.255	.137	.318	.231	.449	-.025	.010	.289
Social isolation is a major cause for high attrition.	-.463	.457	-.125	-.259	-.385	.176	.185	-.224	.025
Absence of counseling and medical health checkups causes high attrition.	.446	.054	-.315	-.439	.115	-.154	.191	.330	-.233
Constant pull of higher salaries	.435	.189	.269	-.317	.155	-.127	.379	-.257	.186
Lack of communication around total value causes high attrition.	.441	.492	.052	.153	.402	-.284	.000	-.178	-.040
Lack of spiritual sessions organized in this organization leads to high attrition.	.458	.140	-.662	-.181	.106	.099	.137	.096	-.120
This organization conduct stress reduction programs like yoga, meditation etc.	-.370	.151	.661	.080	-.170	-.033	-.048	.054	.201
This organization provides sufficient holidays for employees.	-.469	.201	.486	-.149	.160	-.079	.276	.230	.129
Lack of integration and goal setting.	.469	-.149	-.033	.067	.230	.469	.090	.237	.128
Reward systems in this organization are not transparent.	.274	.262	.311	.039	.267	.323	.461	.109	-.251
Low perceived equity of rewards	.400	.108	.129	.417	-.199	.071	.242	-.091	-.441

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

9 components extracted.

Step 3

The Component matrix obtained in the extraction phase indicates the relationship between the factors and the individual variables. Further to identify meaningful factors based on this matrix, the rotation phase of the factor analysis is used which attempts to transfer initial matrix into one that is easier to interpret. It is called the rotation of the factor matrix. The Rotated Factor Matrix with varimax rotation (Rotated Component Matrix) is given in Table 6.5 where each factor identifies itself with a few set of variables. The variables which identify with each of the factors were sorted in the decreasing order and are highlighted against each column and row.

Table 6.5

Rotated Component Matrix

Statements	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Lack of work value and ethics causes high attrition.	.760	.042	-.022	-.036	-.268	.016	-.015	.115	.231
Lack of communication around total value causes high attrition.	.755	.181	.073	-.023	-.168	-.081	-.032	.199	.233
Internal job rotation will lead to high attrition.	.754	-.212	.009	-.017	.004	.173	.112	.080	.046
Mismatching of job expectations creates the problem of attrition.	.640	-.152	.315	-.078	.186	.234	.119	.065	-.152
The culture of this organization is such that it creates a very positive work environment.	.577	.024	.143	-.504	-.125	-.020	.257	-.024	.175
Lack of talent management in the organization leads to high attrition.	.545	-.247	.301	-.060	-.088	.280	.129	.084	-.194
This organization has high standards of corporate governance.	.504	-.414	.139	.006	-.020	.328	.008	.075	-.063
I believe that the organization's leadership is doing what is required for its growth.	.389	-.268	.167	-.044	-.120	.175	.241	.043	.344
This organization's infrastructure is good and makes my work easier.	-.046	.811	.015	.011	.221	-.121	-.025	-.077	-.047
Lack of safe and good transportation facility leads to high attrition.	-.116	.745	-.146	.014	-.005	.145	-.294	-.104	-.149
This organization's location is good and it makes my work easier.	-.033	.641	-.019	-.144	-.054	.163	.243	.362	.087

Statements	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
My organization provides hygiene and timely food to the employees.	-.232	.364	-.206	.333	.106	-.304	-.212	-.280	.182
Lack of spiritual sessions organized in this organization leads to high attrition.	.171	.065	.782	-.302	.062	.029	.129	.077	.030
Absence of counseling and medical health checkups causes high attrition.	.136	-.110	.775	.117	-.169	.186	-.073	.126	.013
This organization conduct stress reduction programs like yoga, meditation etc.	.000	.003	-.656	.429	.127	.180	-.080	-.091	-.044
This organization does not conduct effective motivational programs.	.349	-.115	.503	-.339	-.042	.348	.017	-.073	.012
This organization provides sufficient holidays for employees.	-.081	.230	-.272	.734	.109	.042	-.066	.080	-.021
This organization do not provide welfare measures like housing schemes, health club etc.	.076	.047	-.268	.655	.175	-.361	-.200	-.231	-.084
Introduction of family benefit plans will reduce high attrition.	.423	.118	.002	-.561	.055	.225	.207	-.090	.237
Social isolation is a major cause for high attrition	-.108	.134	-.021	.081	.799	.025	-.307	.006	-.027
I feel that I get self-respect and dignity in this organization.	-.108	.138	-.267	.080	.791	-.018	-.143	-.191	.004
“Work from home option” will reduce high employee attrition.	-.170	.500	.011	.203	.526	-.275	.042	-.046	-.030
Odd working hours causes high employee attrition.	.197	-.084	.014	-.248	.057	.762	.093	.124	.160
Lengthy working hours leads to high attrition.	.069	-.027	.159	.113	-.341	.571	.109	.205	.129
Sleeping disorders causes high employee attrition.	-.356	.443	.119	.043	.279	-.531	.083	.220	-.096
Eye fatigue and vision deterioration leads to high attrition.	.365	-.139	.214	-.033	.275	.498	.269	-.029	.220
Lack of scientific goal setting process causes high attrition.	.112	-.147	-.135	-.197	-.198	.032	.773	.092	.042
Lack of integration and goal setting.	.076	-.143	.245	-.030	-.111	.091	.700	.031	.038
Lack of integration of people in the organization leads to high attrition.	.069	-.117	-.066	-.187	-.510	.187	.593	.035	.141
Salary hike in every six months can be a better option to reduce high attrition.	-.211	.265	-.197	.068	.213	.040	-.135	-.698	.162

Statements	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Constant pull of higher salaries	.362	-.139	.061	.182	.043	.166	.038	.672	.115
I am paid enough for the work I do	.143	.287	-.293	.359	.273	-.231	.001	-.415	-.092
Low perceived equity of rewards	.151	-.149	.000	-.195	-.037	.173	.061	-.096	.736
Reward systems in this organization are not transparent.	.225	-.068	.153	.404	.107	.020	.376	.122	.544
Absence of performance-based bonus causes high attrition.	.041	-.020	-.096	-.289	-.334	.326	-.088	.420	.522

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Rotation converged in 23 iterations.

Step 4

Normally, from the factor results arrived above, factor score coefficients can be calculated for all variables (since each factor is a linear combination of all variables) which are then used to calculate the factor scores for each individual. Since PCA was used in extraction of initial factors, all methods will result in estimating same factor score coefficients. However, for the study, original values of the variables were retained for further analysis and factor scores were thus obtained by adding the values (ratings given by the respondents) of the respective variables for that particular factor, for each respondent.

Conclusion

Thus the 35 variables in the data have been reduced to 9 factor model and each factor may identified with the corresponding variables as follows:

Table 6.6

Factors Identified against Statements Relating to the Attrition Attitude

Sl. No.	Statements	Factors Identified
Factor I	Lack of work value and ethics causes high attrition.	Lack of corporate governance
	Lack of communication around total value causes high attrition.	
	Internal job rotation will lead to high attrition.	
	Mismatching of job expectations creates the problem of attrition.	
	The culture of this organization is such that it creates a very positive work environment.	
	Lack of talent management in the organization leads to high attrition.	
	This organization has high standards of corporate governance.	
	I believe that the organization's leadership is doing what is required for its growth.	
Factor II	This organization's infrastructure is good and makes my work easier.	Lack of infrastructure
	Lack of safe and good transportation facility leads to high attrition.	
	This organization's location is good and it makes my work easier.	
	My organization provides hygiene and timely food to the employees.	
Factor III	Lack of spiritual sessions organized in this organization leads to high attrition.	Absence of Mental Health
	Absence of counseling and medical health checkups causes high attrition.	
	This organization conduct stress reduction programs like yoga, meditation etc.	
	This organization does not conduct effective motivational programs.	

Sl. No.	Statements	Factors Identified
Factor IV	This organization provides sufficient holidays for employees.	Lack of Employee Welfare
	This organization do not provide welfare measures like housing schemes, health club etc.	
	Introduction of family benefit plans will reduce high attrition.	
Factor V	Social isolation is a major cause for high attrition .	Alienation
	I feel that I get self-respect and dignity in this organization.	
	“Work from home option” will reduce high employee attrition.	
Factor VI	Odd working hours causes high employee attrition.	Strenuous work schedule
	Lengthy working hours leads to high attrition.	
	Sleeping disorders causes high employee attrition.	
	Eye fatigue and vision deterioration leads to high attrition.	
Factor VII	Lack of scientific goal setting process causes high attrition.	Lack of Goal setting
	Lack of integration and goal setting.	
	Lack of integration of people in the organization leads to high attrition.	
Factor VIII	Salary hike in every six months can be a better option to reduce high attrition.	Salary Conflict
	Constant pull of higher salaries	
	I am paid enough for the work I do	
Factor XI	Low perceived equity of rewards	Poor reward system
	Reward systems in this organization are not transparent.	
	Absence of performance-based bonus causes high attrition.	

From the above table it is clear that , nine different factors, such as, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting, Salary Conflict, Poor reward system have been identified under attrition attitude.

6.3 MANOVA FOR PERSONAL AND JOB RELATED FACTORS

MANOVA Technique is used in this section for the analysis of Attrition Attitude. The Attrition Attitude scale consisted of 35 statements grouped under nine factors namely Lack of corporate governance, Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting, Salary Conflict Poor reward system MANOVA has been applied to find the significant difference between Attrition Attitude and Personal & Job related Factors.

The hypothesis has been tested with the help of MANOVA, the test statistics, Wilks' Lambda and the corresponding Approximate F value are given for all the Personal and Job related Factors. The effect of the Personal and job related Factors is tested upon the liner combination of nine Attrition Attitude factors, the constant term is given for all the tables given below , however it has no particular importance represented in the below tables for all the personal and job related factors. The constant term, Intercept is given below however it has no particular importance here.

Attrition Attitude Vs Gender

The Attrition Attitude factors namely, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting, Salary Conflict and Poor reward system has been compared with Gender of the respondents. Following table shows the mean values for the nine different factors across gender groups.

Table 6.7**Attrition Attitude Vs Gender**

	Gender					
	Male			Female		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	29.69	5.53	242	28.44	5.11	158
Lack of infrastructure	10.86	1.69	242	10.55	1.89	158
Absence of Mental Health	13.06	2.23	242	13.39	2.15	158
Lack of Employee Welfare	9.10	1.97	242	8.60	1.63	158
Alienation	7.35	2.79	242	6.13	2.08	158
Strenuous work schedule	13.22	2.06	242	12.53	1.95	158
Lack of Goal setting	10.94	2.09	242	11.61	2.43	158
Salary Conflict	8.81	1.77	242	8.62	1.66	158
Poor reward system	10.99	2.43	242	10.68	2.07	158

The table gives the mean scores of Attrition Attitude factors among male and female groups. The Attrition Attitude factors such as Lack of corporate governance (29.69), Lack of infrastructure (10.86), Lack of Employee Welfare (9.10), Alienation (7.35), Strenuous work schedule (13.22), Salary Conflict (8.81) and Poor reward system (10.9) the score are found to be high for the Male employees, similarly Absence of Mental Health (13.39) and Lack of Goal setting (11.61) the scores are comparatively high for the Female employees.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude factors have no significant difference among male and female group of respondents.

Table 6.7(1)**MANOVA for Attrition Attitude Factors Vs Gender**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.005	9508.801	9.000	390.000	**	2.453
Gender	Wilks' Lambda	.836	8.501	9.000	390.000	**	2.453

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (5.042) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 8.501). It is found from the above MANOVA table the scores are found to be significant for all the Attrition Attitude factors. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected. Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the gender groups to find which Attrition factor differs significantly among these two groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 6.7(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Gender Groups)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Gender	Lack of corporate governance	149.178	1	149.178	5.180	*	3.865
	Lack of infrastructure	9.365	1	9.365	2.983	Ns	3.865
	Absence of Mental Health	10.040	1	10.040	2.084	Ns	3.865
	Lack of Employee Welfare	23.306	1	23.306	6.847	**	6.699
	Alienation	143.365	1	143.365	22.336	**	6.699
	Strenuous work schedule	45.163	1	45.163	11.077	**	6.699
	Lack of Goal setting	43.670	1	43.670	8.763	**	6.699
	Salary Conflict	3.290	1	3.290	1.099	Ns	3.865
	Poor reward system	9.079	1	9.079	1.724	Ns	3.865
Error	Lack of corporate governance	11462.999	398	28.802			
	Lack of infrastructure	1249.595	398	3.140			
	Absence of Mental Health	1917.520	398	4.818			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1354.694	398	3.404			
	Alienation	2554.613	398	6.419			
	Strenuous work schedule	1622.734	398	4.077			
	Lack of Goal setting	1983.520	398	4.984			
	Salary Conflict	1191.087	398	2.993			
	Poor reward system	2096.161	398	5.267			

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Lack of corporate governance, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting has significant difference among gender groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other four factors, such as, Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Salary Conflict, Poor reward system do not find any significant difference between male and female respondents. The result reveals that attrition attitude more for male employees when compare female employees.

Attrition Attitude Vs Age

The 9 Attrition Attitude Factors namely, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting, Salary Conflict Poor reward system are simultaneously compared across Age groups. Following table gives the mean values for the nine different factors across age groups.

Table 6.8**Attrition Attitude Vs Age**

	Age											
	20-25 yrs			26-30 yrs			31-35 yrs			36-40 yrs		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	29.50	4.97	169	29.42	5.33	156	28.35	6.16	60	26.67	6.83	15
Lack of infrastructure	10.45	1.64	169	11.00	1.79	156	10.87	2.11	60	10.80	1.32	15
Absence of Mental Health	13.41	2.32	169	13.32	1.90	156	12.62	2.23	60	11.60	2.67	15
Lack of Employee Welfare	8.52	1.65	169	9.51	1.91	156	8.38	1.77	60	8.87	2.26	15
Alienation	6.58	2.42	169	7.28	2.72	156	6.65	2.87	60	6.73	1.67	15
Strenuous work schedule	13.10	1.98	169	13.00	1.84	156	12.78	2.46	60	11.33	2.35	15
Lack of Goal setting	11.50	2.44	169	10.76	2.06	156	11.45	2.30	60	11.60	.63	15
Salary Conflict	8.51	1.69	169	9.22	1.79	156	7.87	1.27	60	9.60	1.12	15
Poor reward system	10.57	2.61	169	11.24	1.96	156	10.80	1.96	60	10.60	2.67	15

The table gives the mean scores of Attrition factors among the employees' age groups. The Attrition factors, Lack of corporate governance (29.50), Absence of Mental Health (13.41), Strenuous work schedule (13.10) are higher for the age group of 20-25 years. Similarly it is high for the factors such as, Lack of infrastructure (11.00), Lack of Employee Welfare (9.51), Alienation (7.28) and Poor reard system (11.24) for the age group of 26-30 years. It is also observed that the Attrition scores are high for the factors Lack of Goal setting (11.60) and Salary Conflict (9 .60) in the age group of 36-40 years.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude factors have no significant difference among age groups of the respondents.

Table 6.8(1)**MANOVA for Attrition Attitude Factors Vs Age**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.004	9716.275	9.000	388.000	**	1.904
Age	Wilks' Lambda	.772	3.883	27.000	1133.802	**	1.756

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (3.883) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 1.756) for all the 9 factors .Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal oneway ANOVA) among the age groups to find which Attrition factor differs significantly among the age groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 6.8(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Age Groups)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
AGE	Lack of corporate governance	162.869	3	54.290	1.878	Ns	2.627
	Lack of infrastructure	25.804	3	8.601	2.762	*	2.627
	Absence of Mental Health	68.796	3	22.932	4.886	**	3.831
	Lack of Employee Welfare	98.931	3	32.977	10.210	**	3.831
	Alienation	43.075	3	14.358	2.142	Ns	2.627
	Strenuous work schedule	45.091	3	15.030	3.668	*	2.627
	Lack of Goal setting	51.748	3	17.249	3.458	*	2.627
	Salary Conflict	102.460	3	34.153	12.386	**	3.831
	Poor reward system	37.971	3	12.657	2.425	Ns	2.627
Error	Lack of corporate governance	11449.309	396	28.912			
	Lack of infrastructure	1233.156	396	3.114			
	Absence of Mental Health	1858.764	396	4.694			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1279.069	396	3.230			
	Alienation	2654.902	396	6.704			
	Strenuous work schedule	1622.807	396	4.098			
	Lack of Goal setting	1975.442	396	4.988			
	Salary Conflict	1091.917	396	2.757			
	Poor reward system	2067.269	396	5.220			
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Employee Welfare, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting and Salary Conflict have a significant difference among age group of the employees at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other factors, Lack of corporate governance, Alienation and Poor reward system does not find any significant difference among Age of the respondents. The employees who are in the age group of 30 years have more attrition attitude than other age groups.

Attrition Attitude Vs Sector Employed

The mean scores of Attrition Attitude and sector employed are presented in the following table.

Table 6.9

Attrition Attitude Vs Sector Employed

	Sector Employed					
	IT			ITES		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	30.18	5.55	136	28.69	5.25	264
Lack of infrastructure	10.76	1.59	136	10.73	1.87	264
Absence of Mental Health	13.03	2.34	136	13.27	2.12	264
Lack of Employee Welfare	9.43	2.03	136	8.63	1.70	264
Alienation	7.13	2.80	136	6.73	2.49	264
Strenuous work schedule	12.82	2.13	136	13.02	2.00	264
Lack of Goal setting	10.91	2.15	136	11.36	2.29	264
Salary Conflict	9.02	1.73	136	8.58	1.72	264
Poor reward system	10.87	2.28	136	10.87	2.31	264

The table gives the average mean scores of Attrition factors among IT an ITES employees. The Attrition factors such as Lack of corporate governance (30.18), Lack of infrastructure(10.76), Lack of Employee Welfare(9.43), Alienation(7.13) and Salary Conflict(9.02) the scores are found to be high for the employees working in IT Sector.

Similarly the Attrition scores are high for the factors, Absence of Mental Health (13.27), Strenuous work schedule (13.02) and Lack of Goal setting (11.36) for the ITES employees. With respect to Poor reward system(10.87) the scores are found to be equal for IT and ITES employees.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude factors have no significant difference among the employees classified based on sector employed.

Table 6.9(1)

MANOVA for Attrition Attitude Factors Vs Sector Employed

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.005	9410.720	9.000	390.000	**	2.453
X3	Wilks' Lambda	.912	4.195	9.000	390.000	**	2.453

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (4.195) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2.453). It is found from the above table that the MANOVA scores are significant for all the factors of Attrition Attitude. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6.9(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Sector Employed)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
X3	Lack of corporate governance	199.507	1	199.507	6.958	**	6.699
	Lack of infrastructure	.062	1	.062	.020	Ns	3.865
	Absence of Mental Health	5.314	1	5.314	1.100	Ns	3.865
	Lack of Employee Welfare	58.721	1	58.721	17.715	**	6.699
	Alienation	14.455	1	14.455	2.144	Ns	3.865
	Strenuous work schedule	3.554	1	3.554	.850	NS	3.865
	Lack of Goal setting	17.719	1	17.719	3.509	Ns	3.865
	Salary Conflict	17.277	1	17.277	5.842	*	3.865
	Poor reward system	.001	1	.001	.000	Ns	3.865

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Error	Lack of corporate governance	11412.670	398	28.675			
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.898	398	3.163			
	Absence of Mental Health	1922.246	398	4.830			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1319.279	398	3.315			
	Alienation	2683.523	398	6.743			
	Strenuous work schedule	1664.344	398	4.182			
	Lack of Goal setting	2009.471	398	5.049			
	Salary Conflict	1177.100	398	2.958			
	Poor reward system	2105.239	398	5.290			
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results show that there is a significant difference for the factors such as, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of Employee Welfare and Salary Conflict. The other six factors such as Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting, , Alienation and Poor reward system the scores are found to be significant. For these factors IT employees are found to be significant and they have more attrition attitude than the ITES employees.

Attrition Attitude Vs Experience

The following table shows the mean values for Attrition Attitude compared with experience of the employees.

Table 6.10**Attrition Attitude Vs Experience**

	Experience											
	1-2 yrs			3-4 yrs			5-6 yrs			7 yrs & above		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	29.93	4.85	128	28.96	5.16	140	29.96	5.08	82	26.70	6.99	50
Lack of infrastructure	10.30	1.62	128	10.94	1.91	140	10.84	1.29	82	11.16	2.23	50
Absence of Mental Health	13.58	2.33	128	13.36	1.92	140	13.17	1.85	82	11.74	2.55	50
Lack of Employee Welfare	8.67	1.90	128	8.74	1.85	140	9.60	1.80	82	8.80	1.63	50
Alienation	6.69	2.46	128	6.74	2.38	140	6.85	3.08	82	7.72	2.60	50
Strenuous work schedule	13.45	1.89	128	12.79	2.06	140	12.82	1.66	82	12.32	2.63	50
Lack of Goal setting	11.59	2.08	128	11.11	2.46	140	10.73	2.21	82	11.24	2.02	50
Salary Conflict	8.70	1.91	128	8.84	1.76	140	8.78	1.49	82	8.44	1.50	50
Poor reward system	10.77	2.30	128	10.79	2.57	140	11.40	1.57	82	10.48	2.38	50

It is observed from the above table the average mean scores of Attrition Attitude factors among experience of IT and ITES employees. The scores are found to be high in Lack of corporate governance(29.96), Lack of Employee Welfare(9.60) and Poor reward system(11.40) for the employees having an experience of 5-6 years. Similarly it is high for Absence of Mental Health(13.58), Strenuous work schedule(13.45), Lack of Goal setting(11.59) for the employees having experience of 1-2 years. With respect to Lack of infrastructure(11.16) and Alienation(7.72), the scores are high for the employees having an experience of 7 years and above. For the factor , Salary Conflict(8.84) the scores are high for the employees having 3-4 years of experience.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude factors have no significant difference among experience of IT and ITES employees.

Table 6.10(1)**MANOVA for Attrition Attitude Factors Vs Experience**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.005	9451.954	9.000	388.000	**	2.453
EXP	Wilks' Lambda	.775	3.824	27.000	1133.802	**	1.756

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (3.824) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 1.756). Since the effect of experience is tested upon the linear combination of the nine perception factors of Attrition Attitude, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. In the MANOVA table, since the F-value for the experience effect is significant the hypothesis that “The perception factors of Attrition Attitude namely, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of infrastructure, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Strenuous work schedule, Lack of Goal setting, Salary Conflict, Poor reward system have no significant difference among Experience groups of respondents.” (No significant effect of Experience on Attrition Attitude) is rejected.

Table 6.10(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Experiences)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
EXP	Lack of corporate governance	436.677	3	145.559	5.158	**	3.831
	Lack of infrastructure	40.161	3	13.387	4.350	**	3.831
	Absence of Mental Health	128.690	3	42.897	9.443	**	3.831
	Lack of Employee Welfare	50.840	3	16.947	5.057	**	3.831
	Alienation	42.932	3	14.311	2.134	Ns	2.627
	Strenuous work schedule	57.471	3	19.157	4.711	**	3.831
	Lack of Goal setting	38.926	3	12.975	2.584	Ns	2.627
	Salary Conflict	6.349	3	2.116	.705	Ns	2.627
	Poor reward system	33.079	3	11.026	2.107	Ns	2.627

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Error	Lack of corporate governance	11175.500	396	28.221			
	Lack of infrastructure	1218.799	396	3.078			
	Absence of Mental Health	1798.870	396	4.543			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1327.160	396	3.351			
	Alienation	2655.045	396	6.705			
	Strenuous work schedule	1610.426	396	4.067			
	Lack of Goal setting	1988.264	396	5.021			
	Salary Conflict	1188.029	396	3.000			
	Poor reward system	2072.161	396	5.233			
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of Employee Welfare, Lack of infrastructure, Strenuous work schedule and Absence of Mental Health, shows a significant difference among experience of the employees at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other four factor Lack of Goal setting, Alienation, Poor reward system and Salary Conflict, does not find significant difference among experience of the employees.

Attrition Attitude Vs Monthly Salary

The attrition attitude factors are simultaneously compared with monthly salary of the employees. The mean scores are depicted in the following table.

Table 6.11

Attrition Attitude Vs Monthly Salary

	Salary																	
	Less than 10000			10001–20000			21001– 30000			30001–40000			40001-50000			Above 50000		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	29.28	3.09	36	27.78	5.28	134	29.44	5.83	103	31.32	5.07	72	30.50	4.72	46	23.33	6.08	9
Lack of infrastructure	11.08	1.32	36	10.84	1.94	134	10.48	1.89	103	10.46	1.47	72	11.20	1.68	46	10.89	1.69	9
Absence of Mental Health	14.00	2.24	36	13.45	2.07	134	13.12	2.17	103	13.00	1.96	72	12.89	2.16	46	10.00	3.24	9
Lack of Employee Welfare	8.72	1.81	36	8.74	1.61	134	8.39	1.84	103	9.25	2.03	72	9.89	1.92	46	10.00	1.58	9
Alienation	8.97	2.87	36	6.47	2.24	134	6.72	2.49	103	6.94	2.15	72	6.46	3.53	46	7.56	1.81	9
Strenuous work schedule	12.86	1.44	36	12.82	2.05	134	13.29	1.94	103	13.04	2.20	72	12.96	2.11	46	10.44	2.13	9
Lack of Goal setting	9.22	2.65	36	11.54	2.20	134	11.71	2.18	103	11.46	1.84	72	10.20	1.94	46	11.56	1.01	9
Salary Conflict	8.78	1.85	36	8.73	1.82	134	8.48	1.48	103	8.83	1.88	72	8.98	1.73	46	9.44	.88	9
Poor reward system	8.64	3.60	36	10.91	1.95	134	11.18	2.19	103	11.33	2.03	72	11.09	1.66	46	10.78	1.99	9

The table gives the mean scores of Attrition factors among monthly salary of IT and ITES employees. The Attrition regarding Lack of corporate governance (31.32) and Poor reward system (11.33) the scores are high among the salary group of Rs.30001-Rs.40000. For Lack of infrastructure(11.20) the scores are high for the salary group of Rs.40001-Rs.50000. Similarly it is high for Absence of Mental Health (14.00) and Alienation (8.97) the scores are found to be high for the employees earning less than Rs. 10000. With respect to Lack of Employee Welfare (10.00) and Salary Conflict(9.44) the scores are high for the earning members of above Rs. 50000. Regarding Strenuous work schedule (13.29) and Lack of Goal setting(11.71) the scores are high for the employees earning an income between Rs.21001- Rs.30000.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude has no significant difference among the employees classified based on monthly Salary.

Table 6.11(1)

MANOVA for Attrition Attitude Factors Vs Monthly Salary

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.005	9432.818	9.000	386.000	**	2.453
X5	Wilks' Lambda	.519	6.061	45.000	1729.775	**	1.567

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (6.061) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 1.567). the hypothesis framed has been rejected for all the nine factors. Since the effect of monthly salary is tested upon the linear combination of the nine perception factors of Attrition Attitude, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. It is found from the above table that the MANOVA score are significant for all the Attrition Attitude Factors.

Table 6.11(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Monthly Salary)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
X5	Lack of corporate governance	985.739	5	197.148	7.310	**	3.064
	Lack of infrastructure	28.130	5	5.626	1.801	Ns	2.237
	Absence of Mental Health	131.367	5	26.273	5.763	**	3.064
	Lack of Employee Welfare	96.497	5	19.299	5.934	**	3.064
	Alienation	195.377	5	39.075	6.152	**	3.064
	Strenuous work schedule	71.618	5	14.324	3.535	**	3.064
	Lack of Goal setting	235.056	5	47.011	10.335	**	3.064
	Salary Conflict	14.937	5	2.987	.998	Ns	2.237
	Poor reward system	207.306	5	41.461	8.607	**	3.064
Error	Lack of corporate governance	10626.439	394	26.971			
	Lack of infrastructure	1230.830	394	3.124			
	Absence of Mental Health	1796.193	394	4.559			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1281.503	394	3.253			
	Alienation	2502.601	394	6.352			
	Strenuous work schedule	1596.279	394	4.051			
	Lack of Goal setting	1792.134	394	4.549			
	Salary Conflict	1179.440	394	2.994			
	Poor reward system	1897.934	394	4.817			
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results are found to be significant for the factors such as , Lack of corporate governance, Lack of Employee Welfare, , Strenuous work schedule, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Goal setting, Alienation and Poor reward system among the employees classified based on Monthly salary at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other two factors, Lack of infrastructure and Salary Conflict does not find any significant difference. The employees who are earning less income have more attrition attitude when compare to other income group.

Attrition Attitude Vs Education

The mean scores for Attrition Attitude and education of the employees are simultaneously compared and results are explained in the following table.

Table 6.12

Attrition Attitude Vs Education

	Education														
	Graduate			Post Graduate			Engineering			Professional Degree			Others		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	27.91	4.61	150	30.05	5.85	110	28.92	5.67	105	33.92	3.33	26	29.56	4.64	9
Lack of infrastructure	10.60	1.33	150	10.31	1.73	110	11.18	2.23	105	11.12	1.45	26	12.11	2.15	9
Absence of Mental Health	13.08	2.09	150	13.54	2.15	110	13.13	2.40	105	12.58	2.23	26	13.22	1.79	9
Lack of Employee Welfare	9.18	1.87	150	8.54	1.77	110	8.47	1.41	105	10.65	2.46	26	8.67	1.94	9
Alienation	6.95	2.62	150	6.25	2.50	110	6.95	2.42	105	8.65	3.02	26	7.00	2.00	9
Strenuous work schedule	13.05	1.73	150	13.00	2.18	110	12.68	2.28	105	13.15	2.05	26	13.22	2.44	9
Lack of Goal setting	10.88	2.30	150	12.04	2.18	110	10.71	2.20	105	11.19	1.83	26	12.22	.83	9
Salary Conflict	8.75	1.72	150	8.37	1.48	110	8.86	1.62	105	9.92	2.31	26	8.00	2.55	9
Poor reward system	10.86	2.65	150	10.95	2.13	110	10.74	2.06	105	11.27	1.85	26	10.44	1.81	9

The table gives the mean scores of Attrition factors such as Lack of corporate governance (33.92), Lack of Employee Welfare (10.65), Alienation (8.65), Salary Conflict (9.92) and Poor reward system (11.27) the scores are high for the employees who are having Professional Degree, Similarly it could be observed that the perception scores respondents having Lack of infrastructure (12.11), Strenuous work schedule (13.22) and Lack of Goal(12.22) setting are found to be high for the employees having other educational qualification. For Absence of Mental Health (13.54) the scores are high for Post Graduates. The effects of education on the Attrition factors have been tested by framing the following hypothesis.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude factors have no significant difference among the respondents classified based on education.

Table 6.12(1)

MANOVA for Attrition Attitude Factors Vs Education

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.004	10038.346	9.000	387.000	**	
Education	Wilks' Lambda	.633	5.239	36.000	1452.005	**	

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (5.239) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value:2.015). Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the education groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among these groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 6.12(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Education)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Education	Lack of corporate governance	920.353	4	230.088	8.500	**	3.367
	Lack of infrastructure	64.364	4	16.091	5.321	**	3.367
	Absence of Mental Health	25.130	4	6.283	1.304	Ns	2.395
	Lack of Employee Welfare	126.488	4	31.622	9.980	**	3.367
	Alienation	127.385	4	31.846	4.894	**	3.367
	Strenuous work schedule	11.294	4	2.823	.673	Ns	2.395
	Lack of Goal setting	126.473	4	31.618	6.571	**	3.367
	Salary Conflict	57.583	4	14.396	5.002	**	3.367
	Poor reward system	8.113	4	2.028	.382	Ns	2.395
Error	Lack of corporate governance	10691.825	395	27.068			
	Lack of infrastructure	1194.596	395	3.024			
	Absence of Mental Health	1902.430	395	4.816			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1251.512	395	3.168			
	Alienation	2570.593	395	6.508			
	Strenuous work schedule	1656.604	395	4.194			
	Lack of Goal setting	1900.717	395	4.812			
	Salary Conflict	1136.795	395	2.878			
	Poor reward system	2097.127	395	5.309			
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

The ANOVA results for each factor, Lack of corporate governance, Lack of infrastructure, Lack of Employee Welfare, Alienation, Lack of Goal setting, Salary Conflict shows that has significant differences among Education groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other three factors, Absence of Mental Health, Strenuous work schedule, Poor reward system do not find significant difference between Education group of the respondents.

Attrition Attitude Vs Shift

The 9 attrition factors have been simultaneously compared with the working shift of the employees. The mean scores are presented in the following table.

Table 6.13

Attrition Attitude Vs Shift

	Shift								
	Day			Night			Both		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Lack of corporate governance	28.39	5.52	166	31.81	5.03	70	28.89	5.10	164
Lack of infrastructure	10.89	1.69	166	10.17	1.90	70	10.84	1.77	164
Absence of Mental Health	12.80	2.30	166	14.00	2.40	70	13.24	1.89	164
Lack of Employee Welfare	9.27	1.91	166	8.43	1.58	70	8.73	1.85	164
Alienation	7.02	2.52	166	5.81	2.18	70	7.16	2.74	164
Strenuous work schedule	12.68	2.11	166	13.90	1.82	70	12.81	1.96	164
Lack of Goal setting	10.84	2.13	166	11.59	2.10	70	11.41	2.40	164
Salary Conflict	8.82	1.74	166	8.56	1.81	70	8.72	1.69	164
Poor reward system	10.70	1.99	166	11.13	2.07	70	10.93	2.65	164

The table gives the mean scores of Attrition factors among working shift of IT and ITES employees. The Attrition factors such as Lack of corporate governance is higher (31.81), Absence of Mental Health(14.00), Strenuous work schedule (13.90), Lack of Goal setting (11.5) and Poor reward system (11.13) the scores are found to be high for the employees working in night shift. Similarly it could observed that the

Attrition scores such as Lack of infrastructure (10.89), Lack of infrastructure (9.27) and Salary Conflict (8.82) the scores are comparatively high for the employees working in Day Shift. With respect to Alienation (7.16) the scores are high for both Day and Night Shifts.

Ho. The Attrition Attitude factors have no significant difference among the employees classified based on working Shift.

Table 6.13(1)

MANOVA for Attrition Factors by Shift

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.005	9440.068	9.000	389.000	**	2.453
Shift	Wilks' Lambda	.844	3.826	18.000	778.000	**	1.957

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

As discussed previously, the hypothesis has been tested with the help of MANOVA. The test statistic, Wilk’s Lambda and the corresponding approximate F-value are given above. The F-value (3.826) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 1.957). Since the effect of shift is tested upon the linear combination of the nine perception factors of Attrition Attitude, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. In the MANOVA table, since the F-value for the shift effect is significant the hypothesis that “The perception factors of Attrition Attitude namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among shift of respondents.” (no significant effect of experience on Attrition Attitude) is rejected.

Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the Shift groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among the these shift groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 6.13(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Shift)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Shift	Lack of corporate governance	604.242	2	302.121	10.896	**	4.659
	Lack of infrastructure	27.637	2	13.818	4.455	*	3.018
	Absence of Mental Health	71.395	2	35.697	7.635	**	4.659
	Lack of Employee Welfare	43.403	2	21.702	6.456	**	4.659
	Alienation	95.610	2	47.805	7.293	**	4.659
	Strenuous work schedule	78.379	2	39.189	9.788	**	4.659
	Lack of Goal setting	38.649	2	19.324	3.858	*	3.018
	Salary Conflict	3.430	2	1.715	.572	Ns	3.018
	Poor reward system	10.195	2	5.098	.966	Ns	3.018
Error	Lack of corporate governance	11007.935	397	27.728			
	Lack of infrastructure	1231.323	397	3.102			
	Absence of Mental Health	1856.165	397	4.675			
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1334.597	397	3.362			
	Alienation	2602.367	397	6.555			
	Strenuous work schedule	1589.519	397	4.004			
	Lack of Goal setting	1988.541	397	5.009			
	Salary Conflict	1190.947	397	3.000			
	Poor reward system	2095.045	397	5.277			
Total	Lack of corporate governance	11612.177	399				
	Lack of infrastructure	1258.960	399				
	Absence of Mental Health	1927.560	399				
	Lack of Employee Welfare	1378.000	399				
	Alienation	2697.978	399				
	Strenuous work schedule	1667.898	399				
	Lack of Goal setting	2027.190	399				
	Salary Conflict	1194.378	399				
	Poor reward system	2105.240	399				

Ns- Not significant

* - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results are found to be significant for the factors , Lack of corporate governance, Lack of Employee Welfare, , Strenuous work schedule, Absence of Mental Health, Lack of Goal setting, Alienation and Lack of infrastructure with respect to working shift of the employees There is no significant difference for the factors Salary Conflict an Poor reward system. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

6.4 REGRESSION ANALYSIS - ATTRITION ATTITUDE

The influence of socio-economic and employment related variables along with other variables namely Organisational commitment, Organisational characteristics, Job Satisfaction on the Attrition Attitude of the employees has been studied using Multiple Regression Analysis. The scores found for Attrition Attitude have been used in this analysis and considered as the dependent variable. The results of the regression analysis are given below

Table 6.14
Regression Analysis - Attrition Attitude

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	105.331	6.800			
Gender	-3.564	.941	-.189	-3.788	**
Age	.064	.138	.030	.467	Ns
Sector Employed	-1.596	.967	-.082	-1.650	Ns
Experience	-1.402	.251	-.364	-5.584	**
Salary	1.445	.454	.194	3.179	**
Education	1.318	.437	.150	3.016	**
English	3.037	3.893	.037	.780	Ns
Hindi	-.038	1.123	-.002	-.034	Ns
Any other	1.005	.927	.054	1.084	Ns
Shift	1.572	.516	.155	3.049	**
Overall score on Organisational Characteristics	-.125	.060	-.134	-2.089	*
Overall score on Job Satisfaction	.107	.028	.230	3.878	**
Overall score on Organisation Commitment	-.004	.047	-.006	-.093	Ns

R	R Square	F	Sig.
.450	.202	7.523	**

The table given above shows the results of regression analysis, giving details of multiple correlation coefficient (R), R², F-ratio value and significance. The R value indicates that a moderate correlation (0.450) exists between the dependent variable (Attrition Attitude score) and the set of predictor variables. The R square value explains that 20.2% of the variation in the dependent variable is due to the ten predictor variables in the equation. The F-ratio value (7.523) and the associated significance level show that R is significant at 1% level.

The regression table shows that, among the thirteen independent variables considered for the regression analysis, seven variables have found to be significant. Among the socio-economic variables, Gender, Experience, Salary and Education were found to have significant effect on Attrition Attitude at 1% level. Among the organization related variables, Organisational Characteristics and Job Satisfaction are found to have significant effect on Attrition Attitude at either at 1% or at 5% level.

Gender wise, (dummy variable coded as 0-Male, 1-Female) Male respondents have higher attrition scores compared females since the regression coefficient is negative. The negative regression coefficient of Experience also shows that employees with more work experience on average will have lesser attrition scores. Salary and Education have positive regression coefficients and hence they can be interpreted as, the employees with higher salary or higher education may have more attrition scores compared to those who have less salary or less educated.

Shift is a variable which should be considered based on the deprivation of the sleep of the employees. The codes have been assigned accordingly that the Attrition scores are higher for employees working in day shift only compared to those who work on both day and night shift, and still lesser for those who work only in night shifts.

Standardized regression coefficients (Beta) are calculated for the variables included in the model. From the Beta coefficients it is seen that, in absolute terms, Experience is more influential on the dependent variable compared to other variables with a beta value of -0.364. Overall score on Job Satisfaction contributes next with a beta value of 0.230 followed by Salary with a beta value of 0.194 among the significant predictors.