

Factors that influence the decision of spanish faculty members to retire

Rosalía Romero-Tena^{ab}, Víctor H. Perera^{ac}, Ángela Martín-Gutiérrez^{ab}

^a *University of Seville, Faculty of Education. Department of Teaching and Organization of Education.*

^b *Member of the GID Research Group. Seville, Spain.*

^c *Member of the IDEA Research Group. Seville, Spain.*

Corresponding author:

Victor H. Perera email: vhperera@us.es

Address: Department of Teaching and Organization of Education, Office 4.13, Educational Sciences Faculty, University of Seville, Pirotecnia Street, 41013 Seville, Spain.

(Dpto. de Didáctica y Organización Educativa, despacho 4.13, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad de Sevilla, C/ Pirotecnia, s/n, 41013 Sevilla, Spain).

ABSTRACT

Recent reports confirm that the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) is conditioning the satisfaction of Spanish faculty members, resulting in a greater number of early retirements. The present study, framed within the context of the R+D+i Project "title removed for anonymous review", intends to understand the factors that influence their decision to retire early. This study is based on the mixed sequential explanatory strategy, using logistic regression analysis techniques with a sample of 311 faculty members. The results showed differences in the factors that influence the decision making of active faculty members who are near (aged 51-60) or approaching (aged 61-65) retirement. Their professional satisfaction, feelings and the reasons for retiring influence their decision about retiring, explaining the culture of early retirement and the loss of human capital in Spanish universities.

Keywords: faculty retirement, early retirement, intellectual capital, faculty member.

1. Presentation and rationale of the problem

In Spanish public universities, teaching and research staff carry out their professional activities from the condition of civil or non-civil servant, to which they access through specific selection processes for each of these two labour regimes, according to Organic Law 4/2007, of April 12th, which modifies Organic Law 6/2001, of December 21st, of universities.

The academic qualification of Doctorate Degree is necessary, although not enough, to hold certain professional categories. Tenured faculty members are in the categories of full professor and associate professor (civil servant), both with full teaching and research capacity. Non-tenured faculty members carry out teaching and research duties according to the contract category, which is temporary for the positions of teaching assistant, assistant professor, adjunct professor and visiting professor, and indefinite for the position of associate professor (non-civil servant). Complementarily, universities, in compliance with their statutes, can elect professor emeriti among retired faculty members who have provided outstanding services to their institution (Hernández-Armenteros and Pérez-García, 2017a)

The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has presented various exhaustive reports on the ability of UE countries to face the socio-economic challenges posed by ageing. These show that the worldwide ageing provides a challenge for all the countries in the developed world, with most of the countries running the risk of finding themselves in an economic and fiscal crisis if they are not able to reform their current systems in the next few years. Taking into account the ageing of the population, the increase in life expectancy and the budgetary constraints due to the financial crisis, many countries have increased their pensions or have legislated increases for the future (OECD, 2011).

As a result of this situation, many public universities in Spain started to worry about the generational change of the population of faculty members, and started early retirement plans right before the economic crisis. This proposition arose when considering that the hiring of new faculty members was more affordable than maintaining the senior faculty member's contracts. It was thought that the decision to retire early would improve the economic situation of the country. However, the lawmakers did not forecast that the encouraging of this type of retirement could result on the one hand, in the social security system having to sustain a greater number of retirees, and on the other, that the universities would let a valuable intellectual capital escape. The older faculty members are valuable human capital due to their experience, information and counseling of university education (Trillo, Zabalza-Cerdeiriña, & Parada, 2015).

In 2006, the University Coordination Council foresaw that this change would occur gradually, as it would find difficulties in the midst of an environment of *inertia and fear of change*. At the start of the century, 6.9% of the Spanish public university faculty member were older than 60; in 2007, it increased to 10.5%, and in 2010, this number increased again to 12.44% (INE, 2010). Throughout the years, it has been observed how the age of active faculty members has been decreasing, with a greater number of early retirements being produced.

The official retirement age for most of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development nations (OECD, 2011) was 65, however, the average employee in most of the OECD nations retires considerably earlier. For example, in

countries such as Austria, Belgium, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland or Spain, early retirement occurs between 3 to 6 years earlier than the stipulated age (Van Droogenbroeck & Spruyt, 2014).

In the R&D and innovation project “*Title eliminated for anonymous review*”, the aim was to determine the opinions of retired and emeritus faculty members, with experience and of recognised prestige, about the university, its social function and its teaching and scientific commitment. It was concluded that most faculty members retired when aged between 61 and 64 (21.04%). The results confirmed that the change in the number of retirees progressively increased throughout the years not only due to the ageing of the active teaching population at the universities (58.9% of Spanish faculty members were aged between 45 and 65), but to other causes or factors that create dissatisfaction, uncertainty and uneasiness, making the professional situation of faculty members more complex, which has led to the contamination of the universities (Andradas & González, 2012). This can make faculty members decide on retiring earlier or dissociating from the university once they retire altogether (Morales, Medina & Fernández, 2015). This is the reason why this study was proposed, which will try to understand the factors that influence the Spanish faculty members’ decision to retire.

2. Background of the study

2.1. Factors that have an influence on the faculty members’ decision to retire

In the scientific literature, four complementary theories are emphasized, which are the rational choice theory (Jex & Grosch, 2012), image theory (Feldman & Beehr, 2011), role theory (Griffin, Loh & Hesketh, 2012) and planned behaviour theory (Ajzen, 1991). These theories allow the identification of important predictors of the real retirement age and the age preferred by faculty members for their retirement. In most of the studies on early retirement, retirement is viewed as the result of a process of informed making of decisions (Wang and Shultz, 2010). This approach views retirement as a motivated option, and supposes that the older employees make their retirement decisions based on the information they possess on the characteristics related to work. Different theories surge around this idea, which try to answer to this making of the decision to abandon the teaching profession.

The theory of rational election by Jex and Grosch (2012), postulates that people choose to retire when the financial resources they possess, as well as their forecast of future economic conditions, will allow them to maintain their consumption needs after they retire.

On his part, Feldman and Beehr (2011), formulate the theory of the image, focusing their attention on the role played by work in the search of a positive self-image. It is expected that the people who perceive themselves as being useful when they work will be inclined to continue working. The studies with an individual focus analyze the characteristics of the faculty member’s performance, academic performance, the road to teaching or the self-efficacy feelings in an attempt to find correlations that can help explain the faculty members decision to leave (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Williams & Dikes, 2015).

Likewise, the role theory considers that the retirement decision is the result of the active search of the change in roles, associated to this transition (Griffin, Loh, & Hesketh, 2012). It is little probable that the people who feel strongly united to their

profession will want to retire. On the other hand, people who feel a strong dissatisfaction with the role, with appears when the expectations of the functions are not sufficiently satisfied, will be more inclined to retire.

And lastly, there is the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). There is a strong influence on the decision to retire from the work attitudes of the worker, the ones he or she possesses towards retirement, and the norms at the workplace (including the social pressure perceived for retirement). The studies that consider the contextual factors take into account factors such as work conditions, initial placement, administrative support, school facilities or school achievements to determine their contribution to the faculty member's burnout (Kelly & Northrop, 2015). Thus, it is considered that the decision to retire is at least partly influenced by the environment where an individual worker operates. This environment not only consists on the family environment, the work conditions and the co-workers, but also includes more structural characteristics related to the retirement guidelines.

Starting with these theories, many researchers have tried to explain and specify the variables that could have an influence on the departure of faculty member. All the research studies, in one way or another, are related to satisfaction. The present research study will work along the same lines as the authors who reduce these theories into two macro-groups related to extrinsic and intrinsic factors, with both shaping the construct of satisfaction and its relation with motivation (Pan, Shen, Liu, Yang, & Wang, 2015; Lindqvist, & Nordanger, 2016; Glazer, 2018).

These factors are joined by the classifications defined by different authors, following criteria such as those by Beehr (1986), which distinguished between personal and environmental factors. Or Damman, Henkens and Kalmijm (2011), who utilized a dichotomy of economic and non-economic factors. Or Wang and Shultz (2010), who highlighted the importance of catering to individual, family and environmental factors, work and organizational factors, and socio-economic factors.

The variables that exerted their influences from the external environment, also named *extrinsic factors* (Lotkowski, Robbins, & Noeth, 2004; Yorke & Longden, 2008), are determined by different causes. For example, Bensunsán and Ahumada (2006) stated that the gap between income and the loss of contractual benefits was the main reason why many faculty members rejected their right to retire. In his work, Oliver (2007) pointed out that the main factors that affected the decision to retire were related to regulation, economic and psychological dimensions, which vary depending on the university. Pan et al. (2015) discovered that the lack of institutional support was an important factor of discomfort. Also, the changes produced in the teaching functions with the implementation of the EHEA in the Spanish universities were important factors for making the decision to leave the teaching profession, as pointed out by Villardón-Gallego, Moro and Atxurra (2017).

Among the variables that referred to the individuals, or *intrinsic variables*, the works by Herranz-Bellidos, Reig-Ferrer, Cabrero-García, Ferrer-Cascales and González-Gómez (2007) as well as Verdugo, Guzmán, Moy, Meda and González, (2008) should be highlighted, as they reviewed how the profession influences the quality of life of faculty members. Thus, the work satisfaction and the personal well-being were affected, resulting in that men as well as women perceived a deterioration in their quality of life as related to the work they performed (Trujillo et al., 2004). In fact, a few studies claimed that when the professional dedication overcomes the personal and

family dedications, the worker finds himself or herself in situations that produce a greater tension, and these signify a greater psychological involvement that results in exhaustion (Triadó, Aparicio, Freixa, & Torrado, 2014). Strier and Bershtling (2016) use the term *resistance* to describe a wide variety of actions and behaviors that occur when an individual fights against a more powerful force, a difference of beliefs or clash of ideas. On his part, Hong (2012) and Lindqvist and Nordanger (2016) pointed to the important role of the collegiate support as a positive contributor to the process of creation of identity for faculty members and their personal satisfaction.

In the Spanish university environment, the first works on the satisfaction of faculty members concluded that the degree of satisfaction of faculty members was above 80% (Alvira & Collazos, 1976). Afterwards, Almarcha (1982), García-Valcárcel (1989) and Sáenz and Lorenzo (1993) reduced it 50%. In spite of these studies and other more recent ones (Morales, Medina, & Fernández, 2015) which showed even more so the decrease in the percentage of satisfaction, and as a result the retirement age being pushed forward, the current literature has yet to identify homogeneous degrees of satisfaction among faculty members. There is no doubt that there is a generalized culture of early departure among faculty members (Eurydice Network, 2012).

Faculty members are subjected to strong work pressures and demands due to their functions and thus suffer high levels of occupational stress, which negatively affects their degree of satisfaction, performance, productivity and health, bringing with it psychosomatic symptoms and serious diseases (Antor, 1999). Diverse studies have allowed the identification of how the symptomatology associated to the *burnout* syndrome has increased in the higher education teaching personnel, manifested as apathy and defensive coping strategies Aisenberg & Aisenberg, 2002; Álvarez, 1998; García 1996; Guerrero & Rubio, 2005; Marrau, 2004, Foley & Murphy, 2015).

2.2. Retirement in Spain

At the national level, where the study took place, article 67 of the Royal Legislative Decree (RLD) 5/2015, from October 30th, which approves the consolidated text of the Law of the Basic Statute of the Public Employee, states that the retirement of the public servants from Spanish public universities can be: a) Voluntary, at the request of the civil servant; b) Imposed, it is declared as effective when the civil servant turns sixty-five. However, the extension of the continuity of active service until the age of seventy could be solicited. The competent public administration will have to resolve, providing reasons, the acceptance or denial of the extension; c) Due to the declaration of permanent disability for the exerting of the functions of the office or level, or due to the recognition of a pension of absolute permanent disability or, total permanent disability related to the exerting of the functions of the office or level.

Regarding retributions, there is a gross basic salary (without considering seniority or research merit) for the different teaching categories. The disparity in the salaries of faculty members is due to the differences between the Spanish autonomous communities and even in the salary table there are important differences, with the full professor being, by far, the position with the highest wage, followed by the associate professor (civil servant), and the position with the lowest wage is that of interim substitute professor, all with full dedication.

All the civil servants belonging to the Regiment of Contributory Classes can solicit voluntary retirement, after working for thirty years for the State and being sixty

years of age. The request should be presented three months before the retirement date requested. If, to complete the thirty years of service the person has to add contribution periods in other Social Security regimes (reciprocal calculation), it is necessary that the last five years of accountable services be covered under the Regime of Contributive Classes of the State (articles 28 2b, 30, 31 and 32 of the RLD 670/87.- Item 6 of the resolution 29/12/85 of the Secretary of State for the Public Administration. – DA 16th Restated Text Passive Classes Law according to DF 1st PGE 2014).

Also, retirement is declared automatically when the servants are 65 years of age. For this, it is necessary to have at least 15 years of accredited service. The administration manages and resolves it automatically if the extension has not been requested (articles 28 2b, 30, 31 and 31 of the RLD 670/87).

Another of the existing possibilities is to request an extension until the age of 70 for retirement. This option is voluntary and should be requested beforehand at least three months before turning 65. The successive annual extensions should be requested three months before the age is reached. The end of the extension should be communicated, at least, three months before the date chosen for the definite retirement, which will not be able to be beyond the age of 70 (article 33 of Law 30/84 (wording provided by art. 107 of Law 13/96), articles 30, 31 and 32 of the RLD 670/87. –DA 25th Law 36/2014 PGE 2015).

In Spain there are currently 426 professor emeriti, with the university making the decision, based on their merits, of whether a faculty member deserves to enter this professional category. However, their number cannot be over 3% of the staff. These are not civil servants; they are hired according to the specific work they do and their salary varies according to such work (seminars and some PhD lectures). They cannot have duties of responsibility, such as department director, for instance, or research project managers.

On the other hand, according to the report of the study coordinated by Hernández-Armenteros and Pérez García (2017b), faculty members have decreased 5 points (49.6% to 44.6%) the presence of civil servants in the workforce and increased 2.4 points (18.3% to 20.7%) the number of full-time non-civil servants to compensate the loss of 6,779 faculty members, mainly due to retirement, most of whom were full professors and associate professors. The validity of the zero rate of replacement during the recession years has modified the demographic structure of faculty members, who have experienced a decrease of almost 8 points (24.4% to 16.1%) in the number of young faculty members (under 40 years of age) and an increase of over 4 points (12.4% to 16.5%) in the participation of mature faculty members (over 60 years of age), involving an aging of almost 6 years in the average age of faculty members (47.6 to 53.6 years).

3. Methods

This research is part of a broader study that followed the mixed method named by Creswell (2008), *explanatory sequential design*, according to which, some qualitative results are utilized to explain other quantitative ones. Thus, a first stage of quantitative research was conducted, followed by a second one, where a qualitative methodology was utilized.

In the *extensive phase*, a questionnaire was written and validated, and it served for

the collecting of data. It was directly disseminated among university faculty members, as well as among academic administrators so that they could support the distribution task. After its reception, the data collected was analyzed. During the *intensive phase*, an interview script was prepared, and a reduced sample was chosen from the faculty members that had answered the questionnaire. These faculty members were interviewed, and the information provided by them was analyzed. The analysis of the objectives in this work was conducted based on the previous analysis of the data obtained in the first phase of the research study.

With this document, we are contributing knowledge on the motives that lead faculty member to make the decision to retire. The objective was to *delimit the elements of satisfaction of faculty members that have an influence on their motivation to retire from their profession*. For this, we asked ourselves: what conditions of professional satisfaction are significant predictors for faculty members thinking about retiring? What feelings are predictors for faculty members thinking about retiring? And, what motives are predictors for faculty members thinking about retiring? To provide answers to these research questions, we focused on the sample of active faculty members whose age range was between 51 and 65 years old.

3.1. Sample

The research from this study takes into account active faculty members who are found in different age groups, from 30 to 73 years of age. For the selection of the participants, the intentionally non-probabilistic sampling technique was used due to accessibility (Bisquerra, 2012). The total number of participating subjects was 941 (with 22% of mortality in the sample), of which 630 (66.95%) were excluded, as they did not meet the criteria established for this study, active faculty members near retirement (early or compulsory). More specifically, this study focused on faculty members aged between 51 and 65 years old, as the objective was to understand the motives they would have for deciding to retire. Thus, the sample was reduced to 311. Within it, two age ranges were used, which allowed us to explain the defining predictors between the faculty members who thought about early or compulsory retirement. The first age range was comprised by faculty members aged between 51 and 60 years of old, for a total of 247 faculty members (79.42%), defined by active faculty members who were near *early retirement*; and the second age range was comprised by faculty members aged between 61 and 65 years old, for a total of 64 (20.58%), who were active faculty members near *compulsory retirement*. For the collection of data, the faculty members were contacted through their institutional email addresses. A questionnaire manager website was utilized in order for the faculty members to be able to complete them online.

3.2. Measurements

The data collection instrument utilized for the collection of data was the questionnaire, designed ad-hoc. The *questionnaire of active and non-active faculty members* was composed by a total of 86 close-ended items that were organized into two blocks. In the first block, the questions that all the faculty members had to answer regardless were placed here. The first series of questions allowed knowing the socio-

demographic variables, as well as the professional status, of the sample. These were: sex, age, current post and years of teaching experience. Following this, the questions about background were found, which alluded to the conditions of access to the university, as well as others that referred to the professional trajectory within the institution. Among these: access route to the university, vital moment of incorporation to the university, reasons why the faculty member opted for the university profession, to take stock of their passage through the university, management positions, reasons for general professional satisfaction and influence of the work conditions in family relationships. Lastly, the degree of satisfaction with the new functions derived from the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) was inquired about, as well as what improvements could be applied. The second block contained the questions that directly referred to the professional satisfaction. This last section was the focus of the study presented here. It is a specific section on the reasons behind the professional satisfaction/dissatisfaction, the reasons why the faculty member would think about retirement, possible future association to the university after retirement, and life projects after retirement.

3.3. Analyses

Among the sample of active faculty members who answered the question “Have you at any time thought about professionally retiring from the University?” the faculty members who had thought about retiring with respect to those who had not were identified, as the object of the study was to identify the motives behind the faculty members thinking about making the decision to retire. Thus, the total sample (N=311) was divided into two groups: (a) faculty members who had answered yes to the question (n1=139; 44.69%; and (b) faculty members who has answered no (n2=155; 48.84%). Seventeen faculty members, 5.47% of the sample, were considered to be lost data, as they did not answer all the items in the questionnaire.

In order to examine and quantify the predictive ability of the variables of our study, a binary logistic regression analysis was performed, following the forward stepwise regression procedure based on the Wald test. This of analysis was developed with the statistical program SPSS™ and served for a double purpose: a) to understand the variables that could better predict the positive response of the active faculty members for their wanting to change to an inactive employment status; and b) to compare the conditions of those faculty members who answered positively to the same question, distinguishing them according to their nearness to early retirement and compulsory retirement.

Three categories for the analysis of conditioning factors were taken into account. The first referred to the reasons that could have contributed to the professional satisfaction of the faculty members. The second mirrored the feelings associated to the thought of retiring from professional life. The third contained different reasons that could drive the faculty members to want to opt to retire. The categories contained a total of 33 items, with 17 of them belonging to the first category, 6 items to the second category, and 10 items corresponding to the third category. All the items were recorded using a 4-point Likert scale (Range of values: 1= None; 2=Little; 3= Somewhat; 4= Much).

3.4. Procedure

This research sought to identify factors that could influence the thinking of active faculty members who are close to early retirement and compulsory retirement from their professional life. For this, the model of binary logistic regression was utilized in order to calculate the probability that a faculty member could or could not belong to the groups of faculty members who think about retiring from their profession before early retirement or before compulsory retirement.

Taking into account this methodological perspective, how the dependent variable ‘to think or not about retirement’ was related to other variables, was established. Table 1 shows the independent variables collected in this study, which correspond to those variables for which information on the factors that could or could not have an influence on their decision was available.

---Insert Table1 at about here ---

Caption: Descriptive statistics for the independent variables: mean and standard deviation.

From the 33 variables available in this study, only ten variables were selected for the regression model, as they were correlated with the dependent variable, and thus, were statistically significant. These will be the ones that will be used to try to provide answers to the great question of the study, the factors that influence the decision to retire.

4. Results

4.1 What conditions for the professional satisfaction are significant predictors of the faculty members thinking about retirement?

It was only possible to create a predictive model for the conditions of professional satisfaction of the faculty member who thinks about early retirement (see Table 2). The predictive model for these faculty members allowed the correct estimation of 63.8% of the cases ($\chi^2=23.32$; $p=.00$), with the variables “SP4” and “SP10” becoming part of the model. These factors accounted for 9% of the explained variance from the dependent variable, thus, there was still an important percentage of influence on the thinking about retirement that does not depend on the variables analyzed. The adjustment value of the model (Nagelkerke R²) was found to be .12 and the value of the Hosmer-Lemeshow was R² .818 and $p=.66$. A predictive model could not be created for the faculty members near (aged 51 to 60) compulsory retirement, as the Hosmer-Lemeshow test, which evaluates the goodness-of-fit of the model obtained, gave a value of $p<.05$.

---Insert Table2 at about here ---

Results obtained from the binary logistic regression for the probability of thinking about retirement in conditions for the professional satisfaction of the faculty member.

As compared to the active faculty members approaching early retirement who do not think about retirement, the results of Table 2 show that the variables referring to “Conditions for the development of research” (SP4) and “relations with their superiors or university managers” (SP10) were significant factors that could be used to predict the response about when the faculty members think about retirement. Therefore, the first factor decreased the probability of thinking about retirement 62%, while the second factor produced the same effect in 68% of the cases. For the set of active faculty members near compulsory retirement, no predictive variables were found, so that it was

not possible to analyze the changes that could have been occurred in both groups of faculty members when faced with thinking about retirement.

4.2 What feelings are significant predictors for the faculty members thinking about retirement?

Two predictive models were created with the feelings of the faculty members who thought about retirement (see Table 3). The prediction model of the faculty members near early retirement allowed the correct estimation of 72% of the cases ($\chi^2=72.01$; $p=.00$), while the predictive model for the faculty members near compulsory retirement allowed the correct estimation of 68.2% of the cases ($\chi^2=10.90$; $p=.00$), with the variables “S1”, “S2”, “S3” and “S5” included in the model. The adjustment value (Nagelkerke R2) was found to be .38 in the first model and .29 in the second model. While the value obtained in the Hosmer-Lemeshow test for the goodness-of-fit was 0.666 and R2=2.382 in the first model and 0.534 and R2 1.667 for the second model.

---Insert Table3 at about here ---

Caption: Results derived from the binary logistic regression for the probability of thinking about retirement based on the faculty member’s feelings.

As for the data related to the active faculty members near early retirement, the results on Table 3 indicated that the variables referring to “relief” (S1), “anguish” (S2) and “happiness” (S3) were significant factors for the prediction of the answer about when these faculty members think about retirement. These factors accounted for 28.6% of the explained variance of the dependent variable. The factors relief and happiness increased the probability of thinking about retirement 5.2 and 3 times, respectively, while anguish decreased this probability by 69%. For the groups of active faculty members close to compulsory retirement, the factor “anguish” decreased the probability of thinking about retirement 79% (S2) while the factor “hope” (S5) increased it 6.7 times. These factors comprised 22% of the explanatory variance of the dependent variable. Thus, there is a variation between both groups as for the number and meaning of some influential variables, with the meaning coinciding with the feeling anguish, although with a difference of 10 percentage points in the intensity.

4.3 What reasons are significant predictors for the faculty members thinking about retirement?

Two prediction models were created with the reasons that could make the faculty member think about retirement (see Table 4). The prediction model of the faculty members near early retirement allowed for the correct estimation of 63% of the cases ($\chi^2=21.57$; $p=.00$), while the predictive model for the faculty members approaching compulsory retirement allowed for the correct estimation of 66.7% of the cases ($\chi^2=56$; $p=.01$), with the variables “M1”, “M2”, “M8” and “M10” included in the models. The adjustment value (Nagelkerke R2) was .11 (Horsmer-Lemeshow of 0.957 and R2=0.653) for the first model and .15 (Horsmer-Lemeshow of 0.837 and R2=0.671) for the second.

---Insert Table4 at about here ---

Caption: Results derived from the binary logistic regression for the probability of thinking about retirement due to diverse reasons.

According to the data obtained, the results from Table 4 indicated that the variables that referred to “workload” (M1), “relationship with superiors” (M8) and “family conditions” (M10) were significant factors for predicting the response about when the active faculty members near early retirement thought about professionally retiring. These factors comprised 21.56% of the explanatory variance of the dependent variable. According to this model, the factors referring to the conditions related to the workload and the relationship with the superiors increased the probability of thinking about retirement 1 and 1.9 times, while the factor related to the family conditions reduced the probability of thinking about retirement by 71%.

For the set of active faculty members near compulsory retirement, the factor associated to the economic conditions increased the probability of thinking about retirement 4.2 times. This factor implied 56% of the explanatory variance of the dependent variable. Thus, it was evidenced that the influential variables did not coincide in both groups of faculty members as factors that conditioned the thinking about retirement. The comment provided by a faculty member in the 61-65 age groups gives an example of this.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The last changes produced by the EHEA have hurt the labor of teaching (Espinosa, 2014; Tesouro et al. 2014), demanding dedication and time that is not mirrored in their work schedule, and even worse, they are not sufficiently valued. These external factors that condition the state of satisfaction at work come into conflict with the personal and family environment of the worker. If the excess of bureaucratic tasks is added to this (Aloe, Shisler, Norris, Nickerson, & Rinker, 2014), the faculty member burns out little by little, at the same time that his or her emotional exhaustion and disappointment increase. These are the reasons why most faculty members retire as soon as they are able to do so.

This fact is important, as it implies the irreplaceable loss of human capital that is difficult to recover (Coleman, 1988). As dealt with in this study, a high percentage of faculty members think about retiring early due to the work factors such as the university reform, the conditions for research and the relationships with their superiors and workload, due to the increased bureaucratic procedures as a result of this reform (Sanz-Menéndez y Cruz-Castro, 2018). Other factors that could have an influence, but not to the same degree or intensity are the economic conditions (Damman, Henkens, & Kalmijn, 2011; Jex & Grosch, 2012). These factors have an influence, at different degrees and as a function of the nearness to the faculty member’s retirement, and this with to retire is manifested as having different feelings, such as being anguished or feeling relieved when the retirement date comes closer.

As shown in the results from the logistic regression, the active faculty members (aged 51-60) had a greater probability of thinking about retirement as the conditions for conducting research and the relationships with their superiors or university managers diminished (Marini, 2018). Also, the improvement of the economic conditions and the worsening of the familial conditions increased the probability of thinking about retirement, resulting in the increase in the sense of relief of the faculty members at the same time that that their feelings of anguish decreased.

Also, for the faculty members who were near the retirement age (61-65), the data indicated that as the conditions for conducting research diminished, as well as the relationships with their superiors or university managers, the probability of thinking about retirement increased. At the emotional level, their feelings of relief and happiness increased as the feeling of anguish diminished.

In this same group of faculty members, the probability of thinking about retirement increased as the workload increased, as well as the relationships with their superiors and as the economic conditions decreased. On the contrary, when the economic conditions increased, the probability of thinking about retirement also increased. This feeling was accompanied by a decrease in the feelings of anguish and an increase of the feeling of hope.

In our study, it was verified which factors had an influence on the making of decisions, more specifically, of Spanish faculty members near (aged 51-60) and approaching (aged 61-65) retirement. Our findings are joined to those from other studies (Borman & Dowling, 2008, Van Droogenbroeck & Spruyt, 2014), which offer results on the abandoning of faculty members, although in these studies, the association between burnout and retirement was not made clear. They instead pointed to other factors that had an influence on the attitude towards abandoning the profession, such as family or environmental factors. Thus, the decision to retire was not only a personal decision, but the sum of contextual factors that directly affected the making of the decision.

In this study, it was confirmed that the conditions for research and the relationships with their superiors were factors that influenced the making of decisions (Marini, 2018). The excess of bureaucratic tasks in some occasions resulted in the faculty members becoming exhausted and burned out (Aloe, Shisler, Norris, Nickerson, & Rinker, 2014), and as a result, they began to think about abandoning their professional life. But the main factor behind the making of the decision was the economic conditions, and in general, the system of pensions and social security was very present before the making of the decision as well. In the case in Spain, some measurements taken, such as removing the Retirement Awards in 2012 for the faculty members, were actions that re-activated the decision to retire early; and proof of this are the data provided in the report from the R&D and innovation Research Project entitled "Title eliminated for anonymous review".

Due to these reasons, most of the faculty members retire as soon as they are able to (Van Droogenbroeck & Spruyt, 2014). But it is not too likely that the minimum age of retirement could be increased, as the results clearly showed that the faculty members close to retirement suffer emotional exhaustion and dissatisfaction due to the workload that is not related to teaching (Marini, 2018 y Sanz-Menéndez y Cruz-Castro, 2018). The institutional support could counteract this discomfort, as well as the changes produced in the teaching functions due to the implementation of the EHEA, besides favoring its progressive and flexible transition to retirement so that it is not a traumatic process for the scholars (Pan et al., 2015; Villardón-Gallego, Moro, & Atxurra, 2017), thereby allowing the university institution to benefit from the knowledge and experience acquired during the faculty member's professional trajectory (Trillo, Zabalza-Cerdeiriña, & Parada, 2015).

The analysis of the current situation of faculty members in Spanish public universities (the highest aging of civil servant faculty members in Europe, with an

average of 52.99 years) and of the reforms of other countries shows that it is necessary to implement in Spanish universities their own policy of human resources, a policy that responds to the requirements of the autonomy and modernization of each university. Among these requirements, this policy should facilitate to the most eminent faculty members the possibility to continue in the Spanish academic life with the aim of disseminating culture in Spain, through the intellectual, scientific, academic and university world. With this study, we aim to claim measures to revive the figure of the faculty member and improve their social prestige from actions that favour professional reflection.

References

- Aisenberg, I. & Aisenberg, E. (2002). Sobre a Síndrome de Burnout em professores. *Eccos revista científica*, 1, 131–151. <http://doi.org/10.5585/eccos.v4i1.297>.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](http://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T).
- Albanesi, S., De Bartoli, M. & Tifner, S. (2006). Aulas que enferman. *Psicología y Salud*, 16, 179–185. Retrieved on from: <http://revistas.uv.mx/index.php/psicysalud/article/view/770>.
- Almarcha, A. (1982). *Autoridad y privilegio en la Universidad española: estudio sociológico del profesorado universitario*. Madrid: C.I.S.
- Aloe, A. M., Shisler, S. M., Norris, B. D., Nickerson, A. B., & Rinker, T. W. (2014). A multivariate meta-analysis of student misbehavior and teacher burnout. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 30–44. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.05.003>.
- Álvarez, A. (1998). *El “malestar docente” o síndrome de burnout del profesor*. Memoria “La Psicología de la Salud en México”, IV Reunión Regional de Psicología de la Salud en el Occidente y Norte de México (pp. 68–69). Guadalajara (México): Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Alvira, F. & Collazos, C. (1976). *El rol del profesor*. Madrid: INCIE.
- Andradas, C. & González, J. (2012). Cuestiones prospectivas del profesorado universitario. *Revista catalana de dret públic*, 44, 191–224. Retrieved on from: <https://www.globalpoliticsandlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Cuestiones-prospectivas-del-profesorado-universitario.pdf>.
- Antor, M. (1999). *Estrés, autoeficiencia y afrontamiento en docentes de preescolar*. Tesis inédita de Maestría. Caracas: Universidad Simón Bolívar.
- Bensusán, G. & Ahumada, I. (2006). Sistemas de jubilación en las instituciones públicas de educación superior y composición por edad del personal académico. *Revista de la Educación Superior*, 35 (138), 7–35. Retrieved on from: <http://www.redalyc.org/html/604/60413801/>.
- Beehr, T. A. (1986). The process of retirement: A review and recommendations for future investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 31–55. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1986.tb00573.x>.
- Bisquerra, R. (2012). *Metodología de la investigación educativa*. Madrid: La Muralla.
- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 367–409. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308321455>.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988), Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, Suplemento, 95–120. <http://doi.org/10.1086/228943>.

- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Education.
- Damman, M., Henkens, K., & Kalmijn, M. (2011). The impact of midlife educational, work, health, and family experiences on men's early retirement. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 66B, 617–627. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr092>.
- Dorfman, L. (2009). Ten years later: A follow-up study of professors still working after age 70. *Educational Gerontology*, 35(11), 1032–1045. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03601270903212294>.
- Espinosa, M.T. (2014). Necesidades formativas del docente universitario. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 12(4), 161–177. <http://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2014.5619>
- Eurydice Network. (2012). *Key data on education in Europe 2012*. Brussels, Belgium: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency-European Commission.
- Feldman, D. C., & Beehr, T. A. (2011). A three-phase model of retirement decision making. *American Psychologist*, 66, 193–203. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0022153>.
- Foley, C. & Murphy, M. (2015). Burnout in Irish teachers: Investigating the role of individual differences, work environment and coping factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 50, 46-55. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.05.001>.
- García-Valcárcel, A. (1989). *Incidencia de los modelos didácticos en la Universidad de Cantabria*. Santander: ICE de la Universidad de Cantabria.
- Glazer, J. (2018). Learning from those who no longer teach: Viewing teacher attrition through a resistance lens. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, 62-71. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.011>.
- González, A. (2006). *Factores psicosociales que predicen la toma de decisión para la jubilación de los docentes universitarios en San Luis Potosí*. Tesis inédita de Maestría. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Griffin, B., Loh, V., & Hesketh, B. (2012). Age, gender, and the retirement process. In Wang, M. (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of retirement* (pp. 202–215). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guerrero, E. & Rubio, J. (2005). Estrategias de prevención e intervención del “burnout” en el ámbito educativo. *Salud Mental*, 5, 27–33. Retrieved from: <http://www.redalyc.org/html/582/58252804/>.
- Hernández-Armenteros, J. & Pérez-García, J.A. (2017a). *Demografía universitaria española: aproximación a su dimensión, estructura y evolución*. Cuaderno de trabajo #9. Madrid: Studio XXI.
- Hernández-Armenteros, J. & Pérez-García, J.A. (2017b). *La Universidad Española en Cifras - 2016/2017*. CRUE – universidades españolas. Retrieved from <https://www.crue.org/Documentos%20compartidos/Publicaciones/Universidad%20Espa%C3%B1ola%20en%20cifras/2018.12.12-Informe%20La%20Universidad%20Espa%C3%B1ola%20en%20Cifras.pdf>
- Herranz-Bellidos, J.; Reig-Ferrer, A.; Cabrero-García, J.; Ferrer-Cascales, R. & González-Gómez, J.P. (2007). *La satisfacción académica de los profesores universitarios*. Actas del V Jornadas de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria. Alicante. Retrieved from: <http://www.eduonline.ua.es/jornadas2007/comunicaciones/2E5.pdf>
- Hong, J.H. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? Understanding teacher resilience through psychological lenses. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 417-440. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2012.696044>.

- INE [Instituto Nacional de Estadística] (2010). *Informe del Instituto Nacional de Estadística sobre la edad del profesorado de las universidades públicas españolas*. Retrieved from: http://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/categoria.htm?c=Eestadistica_P&cid=1254735573113
- Jex, M.S., & Grosch, J. (2012). Retirement decision making. In M. Wang (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of retirement* (pp. 267–280). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, S., & Northrop, L. (2015). Early career outcomes for the “Best and the Brightest”. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(4), 624–656. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215587352>.
- Lindqvist, P. & Nordanger. U.K. (2016). Already elsewhere e A study of (skilled) teachers' choice to leave teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 54, 88-97. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.010>.
- Lotkowski, V.A., Robbins, S.B. & Noeth, R.J. (2004). *The Role of Academic and Non-academic factors in improving college retention*. ACT Policy Report. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED485476>
- Marini, G. (2018). Tools of individual evaluation and prestige recognition in Spain: how sexenio ‘mints the golden coin of authority’. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 8(2), 201-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1428649>
- Marrau, C. (2004). El síndrome de burnout y sus posibles consecuencias en el trabajador docente. *Fundamentos en Humanidades*, 10, 53–68. Retrieved from: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/184/18401004.pdf>
- Morales, N., Medina, D., & Fernández, C. (2015). Satisfacción laboral en profesores investigadores universitarios. *Revista Internacional Administración & Finanzas*, 8(6), 11-28. Retrieved from: http://repositoriodigital.ipn.mx/bitstream/123456789/3799/1/a5_16.pdf
- OECD [The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] (2011). Pensions at a glance, 2011: Retirement-income systems in OECD and G20 countries. Retrieved on from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/finance-and-investment/pensions-at-a-glance-2011_pension_glance-2011-en.
- Oliver L. (2007). Ausencia de regulación en pensiones y jubilaciones de las universidades públicas estatales. *Memorias del IX Congreso Internacional de Investigación Educativa*. Mérida, Yucatán: Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa, A. C. Retrieved on from: <http://www.comie.org.mx/congreso/memoriaelectronica/v09/ponencias/at16/PRE1177690183.pdf>.
- Pan, B., Shen, X., Liu, L., Yang, Y. & Wang, L. (2015). Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction among University Teachers in Northeastern Region of China: A Cross-Sectional Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12, 12761- 12775. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph121012761>.
- Real Decreto Legislativo 670/1987, de 30 de abril, por el que se aprueba el Texto Refundido de la Ley de Clases Pasivas del Estado (B.O.E. 27/5/1987).
- Real Decreto 432/2000, de 31 de marzo, por el que se regula el cómputo en Clases Pasivas de los períodos reconocidos como cotizados a la Seguridad Social en favor de las sacerdotes y religiosos de la Iglesia Católica, secularizados (B.O.E. 8/4/2000).
- Rodríguez, J.R; Urquidi, L.E & Mendoza, G. (2009). Edad, producción académica y jubilación en la universidad de Sonora. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 14 (41) 593–617. Retrieved on from: http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?pid=S1405-66662009000200011&script=sci_arttext.

- Real Decreto 710/2009, de 17 de abril, por el que se desarrollan las previsiones de la Ley 2/2008, de 23 de diciembre en materia de Pensiones de Clases Pasivas y de determinadas Indemnizaciones Sociales (B.O.E. 30/4/2009).
- Resolución de 18 de marzo de 2010, de la Dirección General de Costes de Personal y Pensiones Públicas, por la que se regula la gestión electrónica del impreso "J" de iniciación del procedimiento de reconocimiento de pensiones de jubilación de los Funcionarios Civiles incluidos en el Régimen de Clases Pasivas (B.O.E. 8/4/2010).
- Sáenz, O. & Lorenzo, M. (1993). *La satisfacción del profesorado universitario. Monográfica. Pedagogía*. Granada: Monografías de Pedagogía. Universidad de Granada.
- Sanz-Menéndez, L. & Cruz-Castro, L. (2018). University academics' preferences for hiring and promotion systems. *European Journal of Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1515029>
- Skaalvik, E.M. & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 152-160. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.006>.
- Strier, R., & Bershtling, O. (2016). Professional resistance in social work: Counterpractice assemblages. *Social Work*, 61 (2), 111-118. <http://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sww010>.
- Tesouro, M., Corominas, E., Teixidó, J., & Puiggalí, J. (2014). La autoeficacia docente e investigadora del profesorado universitario: relación con su estilo docente e influencia en sus concepciones sobre el nexo docencia-investigación. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 32(1), 169–186. <http://doi.org/10.6018/rie.32.1.172771>.
- Torra, I., de Corral, I., Pérez, M.J., Triadó, X., Pagès, T., Valderrama, E., Márquez, M.D., Sabaté, S., Solá, P., Hernández, C., Sangrà, A., Guàrdia, G., Estebanell, M., Patiño, J., González, A., Fandos, M., Ruiz, N., Iglesias, M.C., & Tena, A. (2012). Identificación de competencias docentes que orienten el desarrollo de planes de formación dirigidos a profesorado universitario. *REDU–Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 10(2), 21–56. <https://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2012.6096>.
- Triadó-Ivern, X., Aparicio-Chueca, P., Freixa-Niella, M., & Torrado-Fonseca, M. (2014). Satisfacción y motivación del profesorado en el primer curso en grados de ciencias sociales. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 13(1), 203–229. <http://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2015.6454>.
- Trillo, F., Zabalza-Cerdeiriña, A. & Parade, A. (2015). La visión del profesorado emérito sobre los estudiantes: aprendiendo de los mayores. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 13(2), 143-169. <http://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2015.5442>.
- Trujillo, S., Tovar, C. & Lozano, M. (2004). Formulación de un modelo teórico de la calidad de la vida desde la psicología. *Universitas Psicológica*, 3, 89-98. Retrieved on from: <http://www.redalyc.org/html/647/64730109/>.
- Van Droogenbroeck, F., & Spruyt, B. (2014). To stop or not to stop: an empirical assessment of the determinants of early retirement among active and retired senior teachers. *Research on Aging*, 36(6), 753-777. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0164027513519449>.
- Verdugo, J. C., Guzmán, J., Moy, N. A., Meda, R. M., & González, Ó. P. (2008). Factores que influyen en la calidad de vida de profesores universitarios. *Psicología y Salud*, 18(1), 27–36. Retrieved on from: <http://revistas.uv.mx/index.php/psicysalud/article/view/672>.

- Villardón-Gallego, L., Moro, A. & Atxurra, C. (2017). Percepciones sobre la jubilación en el profesorado universitario. El caso de la Universidad de Deusto. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 20(1), 87-99. <http://doi.org/10.6018/reifop/20.1.255161>.
- Wang, M., & Shultz, K. S. (2010). Employee retirement: A review and recommendations for future investigation. *Journal of Management*, 36, 172–206. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309347957>.
- Williams, J., & Dikes, C. (2015). The implications of demographic variables as related to burnout among a sample of special education teachers. *Education*, 135(3), 337-345. Retrieved on from: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/prin/ed/2015/0000135/00000003/art00010>
- Yorke, M. & Longden, B. (2008). *The first-year experience of higher education in the UK*. UK: The Higher Education Academy.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for the independent variables: mean and standard deviation.

| Variable | Early Ret. (n = 247) | | Compulsory Ret (n = 46) | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|
| | SD | M | M | SD |
| <i>Reasons for the professional satisfaction of the faculty members</i> | | | | |
| SP1: Professional stability. | 2.31 | .730 | 2.39 | .681 |
| SP2: Economic conditions. | 3.30 | .770 | 3.25 | .909 |
| SP3: Research as a professional activity. | 2.32 | .849 | 2.36 | .897 |
| SP4*: Conditions for conducting research. | 3.41 | .703 | 3.56 | .639 |
| SP5: Teaching as a professional activity. | 2.56 | .857 | 2.66 | .781 |
| SP6: Conditions for conducting research. | 3.37 | .731 | 3.39 | .657 |
| SP7: Relationships with the students. | 2.77 | .883 | 2.91 | .886 |
| SP8: Behaviors and attitudes of the students. | 2.70 | .733 | 2.69 | .852 |
| SP9: Relationships with the peers. | 2.02 | .783 | 2.19 | .732 |
| SP10*: Relationships with their superiors/university managers. | 3.14 | .731 | 3.08 | .803 |
| SP11: Possibility to publish and disseminate knowledge. | 3.00 | .870 | 2.97 | .959 |
| SP12: The easiness for continuous learning. | 2.94 | .908 | 2.98 | .900 |
| SP13: Professional conditions. | 2.99 | .829 | 2.98 | .845 |
| SP14: The possibility of belonging to professional networks or teams. | 2.73 | .885 | 2.61 | .936 |
| SP15: Possibility to travel and attend professional meetings. | 1.78 | .793 | 1.88 | .724 |
| SP16: The teaching conditions caused by the EHEA. | 1.64 | .740 | 1.72 | .654 |
| SP17: Work conditions due to the education laws. | 3.03 | .796 | 3.03 | .734 |
| <i>Feeling/ emotional disposition</i> | | | | |
| S1*: Relieved. | 2.14 | .985 | 2.04 | .952 |
| S2*: Anguished. | 1.91 | .968 | 1.64 | .857 |
| S3*: Happy. | 2.12 | .974 | 2.16 | .999 |
| S4: Sad. | 2.31 | 1.055 | 2.24 | 1.015 |
| S5*: Hopeful. | 1.96 | .903 | 1.89 | .982 |
| S6: Worried. | 2.16 | 1.000 | 1.96 | 1.053 |
| <i>Reasons for retirement</i> | | | | |
| M1*: Workload | 1.42 | 1.038 | 1.12 | 1.084 |
| M2*: Economic conditions. | 1.22 | .891 | .90 | .951 |
| M3: Characteristics and/or behavior of the students. | 1.11 | .929 | .92 | .964 |
| M4: Relationship with peers. | 1.09 | .901 | 1.04 | .922 |
| M5: Types of tasks to be performed. | 1.35 | .982 | 1.19 | 1.065 |
| M6: Conditions from the implementation of the EHEA. | 1.59 | 1.010 | 1.52 | 1.167 |
| M7: Family/personal status | 1.11 | 1.026 | 1.15 | 1.052 |
| M8*: Relationships with their superiors | .89 | .864 | .81 | .790 |
| M9: Health status. | 1.18 | 1.092 | 1.17 | 1.136 |
| M10*: Family conditions. | 1.05 | 1.037 | 1.15 | 1.052 |

* Variables selected for the regression model.

Table 2

Results obtained from the binary logistic regression for the probability of thinking about retirement in conditions for the professional satisfaction of the faculty member.

| | B | SE | Wald | p | OR | C.I. 95% |
|------------------|--------|------|--------|-----|-------|-------------|
| Early retirement | | | | | | |
| SP4 | -0.957 | .387 | 6.134 | .01 | 0.384 | 0.180-0.819 |
| SP10 | -1.125 | .311 | 13.127 | .00 | 0.325 | 0.117-0.597 |
| Constant | 1.508 | .415 | 13.217 | .00 | 4.518 | |

Note. B=coefficient; SE=standard error; p=probability; OR=odds ratio; C.I. =confidence interval at 95%

Table 3

Results derived from the binary logistic regression for the probability of thinking about retirement based on the faculty member's feelings.

| | B | SE | Wald | <i>p</i> | OR | C.I. 95% |
|-----------------------|--------|------|--------|----------|-------|--------------|
| Early retirement | | | | | | |
| S1 | 1.658 | .522 | 10.084 | .01 | 5.251 | 1.887-14.613 |
| S2 | -1.167 | .334 | 12.196 | .00 | 0.311 | 0.162-0.599 |
| S3 | 1.105 | .508 | 4.738 | .03 | 3.021 | 1.116-8.173 |
| Constant | -1.434 | .409 | 12.292 | .00 | 0.238 | |
| Compulsory retirement | | | | | | |
| S2 | -1.579 | .756 | 4.362 | .04 | 0.206 | 0.047-0.907 |
| S5 | 1.907 | .750 | 6.461 | .01 | 6.730 | 1.547-29.276 |
| Constant | -0.202 | .519 | 0.151 | .03 | 0.817 | |

Note. B=coefficient; SE=standard error; *p*=probability; OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval at 95%

Table 4

Results derived from the binary logistic regression for the probability of thinking about retirement due to diverse reasons.

| | B | E.T. | Wald | <i>p</i> | OR | I.C. 95% |
|-----------------------|--------|------|--------|----------|-------|--------------|
| Early retirement | | | | | | |
| M1 | 0.601 | .340 | 4.124 | .04 | 1.996 | 1.024-3.890 |
| M8 | 0.648 | .322 | 4.047 | .04 | 1.911 | 1.017-3.592 |
| M10 | -1.239 | .311 | 15.855 | .00 | 0.290 | 0.158-0.533 |
| Constant | -.329 | .308 | 1.139 | .02 | .720 | |
| Compulsory retirement | | | | | | |
| M2 | 1.435 | .627 | 5.232 | .02 | 4.200 | 1.228-14.365 |
| Constant | -.847 | .488 | 3.015 | .03 | .429 | |

Note. B=coefficient; SE=standard error; *p*=probability; OR=odds ratio; C.I. =confidence interval at 95%