

An empirical review of Motivation as a Constituent to Employees' Retention

Adanma Cecilia Eberendu , Rita Kenneth-Okere
Madonna University, Elele, Rivers State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT : This study investigated the link between motivation and retention and the effect of motivation on retention at different organisational levels. The research linked motivation and high job satisfaction to explore strategies that help in employees' retention and why public sector employees leave with particular reference to Federal Medical Centre (FMC) Owerri. This was achieved by collecting primary data from Federal Medical Centre (FMC) on non-clinical staff/employees (managers and non-managers and secondary data from published materials and the hospital's human resources (HR) data. The findings were tested using employee motivational attributes to prove that motivation plays a crucial role in enhancing employee retention. Motivation was found to be a core factor that determines the level of employee retention among managers and non-managers within the case study organisation. Specifically, it was found out that employees tend to be motivated if they are subjected to performance-based compensation, recognition for good work, and encouraged to pursue individually fulfilling tasks.

KEYWORDS: *Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Retention, Organization, Employees*

I. INTRODUCTION

Organisations go a long way to recruit workers, who after a short period move on to another organisation. Employers and managers should have efficient motivation and retention strategies in order to retain these great people. This work is an extension of previous research on related topic by human resource experts and other renowned scholars. According to Bloom & Berinato (2014), Ctrip, a company in US was able to save about \$1,900 per employee as a result of working from home-flexible working arrangement. The academic focus and research rationale in addition to the objectives stated below is to reduce or completely eradicate the loss of intellectual capital in public sector organisations in particular and private sector organisations in general. It is to reduce constant staff turnover, increase productivity and profitability in organisations, and to improve on already existing motivation strategy to retain employee. One of the questions to be answered here is whether motivation has anything to do with retention and at what level of the organisation does this have more effect? Another question is to check whether motivation has any link with high job satisfaction, increased performance, and retention. The research will also look at why people leave and what are those motivation strategies that help in workers retention. Furthermore, comparison of two organisations; one of small scale and another of a larger scale may be carried out to know the strategies in place for retention in both organisations.

However, it is important to note that in difficult economic times such as now retention may be higher because it is difficult or hard to find other work. Although, Kumar & Arora (2012), argue that nowadays organisations are afflicted with talent shortage issues, and administrators and managers have realised the competitive advantage in having competent staff. Furthermore, efficient and productive workforce make organisations to survive, and flourishing is consequential to rapidly increasing focus on retaining key talent or valued employees. This group represent the total of the inherent abilities, acquired knowledge, capabilities and skills. Again, diversity in workforce, sex, age, qualifications, competence, experience, quality, and perception have increased retention issues. The above claim on efficient and productive workforce can further be buttressed by the fact that Federal Medical Centre is interested in attracting and retaining high quality staff in order to provide patients with the best clinical care possible. Considering the merits of long service and the role of experience in business it is vital for management to preserve vital employees for companies' success and survival. It is absolutely necessary for employers to maintain adequate number of employees as people leave due to various reasons in these competitive industries (Adam et al, 2007). Similarly, companies' keeping skilled employees via motivation is crucial because of the time and money it takes to replace them. While a small number of employees leaving an organisation is naturally acceptable, Kumar & Arora (2012) and other human resources management (HRM) experts opined that high turnover is of serious concern. Increased attrition level adversely affects the overall performance of any organisation, and needs to be monitored and managed carefully. From a retention perspective, employees that are strategic to the mission and difficult to replace should be the focus of most businesses, much effort should be made to keep them (Breslin, 2013).

Considering self determination theory (SDT), “*Work climate that promote satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness enhances employees’ intrinsic motivation and promote full internalisation of extrinsic motivation that yield important work outcomes in return*” (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Hence, high retention level depends on having a great workforce. To become an employer of choice with high rate of employee retention, organisations must focus on strategies that enhances motivation, recognition and rewards (Branch, 2011). Analogously, the problem of employee retention can be addressed through a variety of proactive retention strategies, workplace policies and practices which would not only help offset negative impact of employee retention but also work proactively to increase it (Kumar & Arora, 2012). According to Drost (2010), employee’s career future, job performance, organizational support and job satisfaction are all part of their decision to remain with an organization in today’s complex and competitive job market. In this research, however, organisational support (motivation) will be looked at as a key element to their decision to remain (retention). Public sector organisations are distinguished from other organisations and are made attractive to employees by emphasising on motivational factors such as available career opportunities, skills and training needs for a challenging future position. It is important to stress that this is an extension of earlier studies, (Drost, 2010; Masibigiri & Nienaber, 2011), which established that managers relationships to subordinates are key to their motivation and retention. Based on the above claims, the study will further carry out a critical literature review in following section to explore these claims further. This study therefore investigated the link between motivation and retention, and the effect of motivation on retention at different levels of the organisation in which high job satisfaction and motivation strategies were explored.

II. RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Motivation

Most organisations are not immune to national economic pressures affecting the geographical regions the organisation serves. Larger workforce presents challenges for recognising and rewarding the aspirations and contributions of the employees as it may equate to more expansive capabilities for serving clients (Branch, 2011). According to Cristescu et al (2013), employees could be intrinsically or extrinsically motivated; the intrinsic factors of motivation are relations between the expectations, perceptions and feelings of an individual on the one hand, and the actual content of the individual’s work and behaviour on the other hand. Extrinsic motivation is also based on individual-organisation relationship and is meant to meet employee’s expectations with regard to the organisational reactions in relation to employees’ efforts, behaviour and results. Vroom (1964) defines motivation as the ‘force’ impelling a person to perform a particular action, determined by the interaction of (i) person’s expectancy that the act will be followed by a particular outcome and (ii) the valence of that outcome, which in turn is a function of the valences of all other outcomes. The main idea behind Maslow’s needs hierarchy concerns employers responsibility to provide environment of workplace that encourages and enables employees to fulfil their own unique potential or self-actualisation (Maslow, 1954). This hierarchy of needs model/theory developed in the 1940-50s remains valid till today for the understanding of human motivation, management training and personal development (Maslow, 1943). With this theory managers understand how to motivate employees and channel motivation towards work for retention (Manion, 2005). Knowing the purpose of the job and doing everything with that purpose in mind increases motivation. Focusing exclusively on extrinsic rewards costs more and do not increase commitment (Ayers, 2008). However, four intrinsic rewards that increase motivation are senses of meaning, choice, competence and progress. This is in line with Meyer et al (2003) argue that building effective commitment involve more than paying well, and that retention based on compensation base commitment (motivation) is of course sensitive to changes in compensation within the organisation. Organisations that indulge in this form of retention strategy are often vulnerable to the possibility that competitors may use better wage offers to lure away employees. Hence, Smith (2001), states that money gets employees to the door, but does not keep them there.

According to Jeswani and Souren (2008), employees’ engagement is necessary in their retention as disengaged employee disturbs the system and can multiply dissatisfaction level resulting to decreased motivation, diminished performance and high employee turnover. Again, Kumar & Arora (2012) argue that the determinants affecting an employee’s decision to stay or leave an organisation depends primarily on organisational culture, probably because of the fact that job satisfaction and performance level are influenced by working conditions. Therefore, performance level and job satisfaction depend on working conditions. This is also in line with Kuvaas (2008) conclusion in his research on Employee-Organisation Relationship (EOR). Developmental perception of HR practices by employees may not translate into higher work performance. Again, poorly managed employee-organisation relationship should not be compensated with investment in HR practices because work performance may actually be reduced by developmental practices due to lack of high quality employee-organisation relationship (Kuvaas B., 2008).

According to Siegfried Jr (2008) employees work with integrity and passion when employers of labour identify, engage and retain people who enjoy what they do, this is the bottom line. Siegfried Jr (2008) added that staff turnover can better be controlled at the point of recruitment. Also, recruiters need to identify among other preferences whether an applicant is a road warrior (just after money) or not, and to understand the kind of career path employees are looking for. Getting employees to be committed is very important to any business because, O'Malley (2000) stated that commitment is critical to organisational performance but not a panacea. There are other ingredients O'Malley explains that need to be added to mix, to achieve important organisational ends and when blended in the right complements, motivation becomes the result.

According to Barber (2009), motivation can be negative or positive, that inspiration taps into our inner good and better day is always seen coming and it is always positive. Intrinsic motivation prevails over the extrinsic one when referring to the activity in a public institution, which deals with educational services, while the activity in a private company, which deals with car construction, is dominated by the extrinsic motivation (Marius & Radu, 2009). Scott (2012) in conjunction with other HRM literature was able to point out that money alone may not be a huge motivator for top performances in an organisation, especially the NPOs. Organizations that have taken employee-centric investment approach to rewarding employees for their contributions consistently achieve best-place-to-work status. Statutory organizations that have invested in a partnership between human resources and line management to implement an effective employee reward strategy-one that makes a meaningful distinction around employee performance-have tended to fare better than their counterparts in Office of Personal Management (OPM) biannual survey (Rowson, 2009). This point can be stressed further by the talk with Maria Paviour on employee engagement: 'we need to look at the way we reward and pay people, because we know through research that bigger bonuses do not motivate. In fact, bonuses crush creativity: the bigger the bonus, the worse the performance (IDS HR in Practice, 2013). Scott (2012), suggested that Key employees should indicate the benefits they value most, and rewards programme should be customised to satisfy them. This point seems to tally with that of the critics of expectancy theory in some ways; particularly that of Edward Lawler's new proposal for expectancy theory which is not against that of Vroom's theory. For instance, one of the four claims Lawler's model is based on is that individual's belief of their desired outcome being achievable through their action(s), (Lawler & Suttle, 1973). The FMC may be facing specific human resources concerns; the variety of employee motivation, recognition, rewards and retention steps taken may be altered or adapted to address varying circumstances (Branch, 2011). Again, Branch argues that compensation is a motivating factor for employees; however, addressing it in difficult economic times is not always very easy. According to People Management (2008), most people go to work for money, and that there are different motivators for workers with similar skills. The earlier statement was contradicted by Psychologists affirming that money is generally a powerful de-motivator and a weak long-term motivator (People Management, 2008). Rawson (2009) further argues that there is the need to develop programmes that help federal workers achieve work-life balance and consequently reduce stress in the workplace, which was supported by the 2008 Human Capital Survey conducted by the Office of Personal Management (OPM). Public sector organisations have distinguished themselves and are recognised for 'best practice' and as best places to work by the workforce which appears to be one of the reasons why those that stay or last on a job do.

2.2 Motivation Approach in the Federal Medical Centre (FMC) Owerri

Motivating FMC employees requires lots of resources including time, and an attempt to avoid such investment could be costly or devastating to an organisation. An increased turnover is one of the consequences of not investing in employee motivation which invariably increases labour cost. To avoid/ reduce turnover cost, Dermody et al (2004) emphasise that managers should understand and monitor employees' motivation. To inspire sense of duties of subordinates in the FMC, managers endeavour to discover their internal feelings in the interest of the care sector. Again, job satisfaction with regard to employees' motivation is of great importance since satisfied employees feel happy and are able to deliver when adequately rewarded. Job satisfaction therefore plays a great role with regards to non-attendance, work performance, labour turnover and tendency to quit, which Tutuncu and Kazak (2006) say leads to cost efficiency. Wage rates below minimum wage or prevailing market rate will lead to employee dissatisfaction, unacceptable behaviour and lack of professionalism, or even worse still, increase staff turnover (Akerlof Yellen, 1986, cited in Taylor and Taylor, 2011). While higher pay results in rise in productivity, employee responsibility and loyalty and workplace cohesiveness (Westly & Schmidt, 2006, cited in Taylor & Taylor, 2011). Most researchers, (Miller (1980), and Ting (1997)), are of the opinion that there exist a direct relationship between job satisfaction and pay, thus they are strongly correlated or linked.

2.3 Retention

According to Cran (2012), the biggest challenge facing an organisation is keeping or retaining top talents (valued employees), considering today's workers attitudes and changing times. Retaining talent refers to employers' efforts to create an environment that engages employees for the long term and ensures that they keep desirable workers in order to meet business objectives (Masibigiri & Nienaber, 2011; Frank, Finnegan & Taylor, 2004). However, if employees are not satisfied with these efforts they can leave. Therefore, retention results from mutual satisfaction between employees and employers and occurs voluntarily (Kontoghiorghes & Frangrou, 2009). It is because of the significant importance of talent retention as a strategic tool to ensure work-performance superiority that it continues to top the list of priorities of CEOs (Kumar & Arora, 2012). As stressed by Siegfried Jr (2008), lack of proper communication to eliminate uncertainties could also make employees leave: "If there is bad news be honest and let employees know what the plan is as soon as possible;" and that "The longer people sit in an uncertain situation, the more likely they are to start taking those phone calls and start looking around". Establishing proper communication between managers and subordinates is paramount to retention. Benefits and pay may be additional incentives or ways but not main reasons for employees' retention. For instance, communication, employee absenteeism, and productivity were found to go concurrently and poor communication is one of the main reasons for employee turnover (Drost, 2010).

Leadership is another key factor to employee retention (Masibigiri & Nienaber, 2011). They argue that leadership play an important role in the needs of employees, manager-leader must communicate with employees regarding their needs; likes and dislikes. As soon as employees think that their values are incompatible with those of their organisations, they are prepared to leave. Furthermore, ongoing leadership skill development from the Top bottom is very crucial, since people do not leave their jobs but leave their leaders (Cran, 2012).

Scott (2012) states that employers must focus retention efforts on their highest performers in order to strive in today's economy. Lochhead and Stephens (2004) emphasis that skills, experience and corporate memory are lost when business losses employees: Consequently, productivity, profitability and quality of product and services are affected depending on the nature and magnitude of the loss, which is a critical management issue. It is important to point out that most of the retention practices (Recognition and Rewards; Compensation and Benefits; Training, Professional Development, Career Planning; Recruitment and Orientation; Healthy Workplace or Wellness Programmes; Work-life Balance; Job Design and Work Teams; Employee participation and Communication) listed in the HR literatures including (Lochhead and Stephens, 2004) are factors that inspire and build motivation (motivation factors). Ashby and Pell (2001 cited in Lochhead and Stephens, 2004) argue that inflexible companies characterised by dominant and autocratic organisational culture are likely to have dissatisfied employees not minding how fantastic the incentives to stay might be. Again, in evaluating disutility from work effort arising from different external constraint (care for sick family member or children) that draws on someone's energy and work concentration, Delfgaauw and Dur (2008) reported a remarkable difference in the number of workers that move from private sector jobs to public sector job where flexible work arrangement is highly practiced than those that move from public to private sector.

According to Siegfried (2008), even though Siegfried Group look for people that identifies with the organisation's culture and are experienced, the Group still promise them a distinctive culture that balances career and life; compelling business strategy; work that is both challenging and personally gratifying; attractive compensation and other benefits. Parry (2008) argues that organisations that invest in their staff are best placed to save money, improve staff motivation and increase employee retention. According to the report on Nurturing Talents, successful organisations are typified by using formal training policies to nurture talents, and that over three quarters of employers see skills development as more beneficial to their organisation than external recruitment. She added that organisations do not only save money by growing their own but will also get required talent. This is why organisations that have identified key employees never let them go.

2.4 Employee Retention Motivation

Paying above the labour market, according to Scott (2012) helps retain good people, which 'retention of key talent and the role of rewards' confirm. However, IDS (institute of development studies) HR in Practice (2013), suggests that organisations need to be mindful of how they reward and pay employees. And that research has shown that bigger bonuses do not motivate, rather bonuses crush creativity: the bigger the bonus, the worst the performance. Although the case study of Home Group in the same IDS HR in Practice (2013), argues that talent could be lost when mediocre are financially rewarded, hence the introduction of performance based increment as against the old fashioned tenure based system of pay increment. 'If organisation wants to have a more productive workforce, you need to have people who are emotionally engaged' (IDS HR in Practice, 2013). This implies that more productive workforce results in high productivity and increased profitability. Bloom & Berinato (2014) viewed this idea from the flexible work angle when they say "To raise productivity, let more employees work from home". In comparison with the staff that came into the office, the study revealed

that at-home workers were not only happier and less likely to leave but also more productive. Again, one of the reasons for the Ctrip experiment is to prove that flexible working does not hinder performance but motivates.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Both primary and secondary data were utilised in this research. Interviews, questionnaires and case study were the techniques used for the primary data collection, and this broadens the depth of the data given that just one organisation is under study (Cochran, 2007; Cohen et al, 2007). The determined samples are made up of five managers and twenty-five (25) non-managers, making a total of thirty (30) respondents. This sample size was considered ideal and a good representation of the entire population. Again, the choice of this sample size was in view of the resources (time and money) available, more so that the research was self sponsored and the researchers' choice of precision level (Cochran, 2007).

IV. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Data was analysed using inferential statistics. Specifically, the regression analysis was carried to establish the link or relationship between motivation and retention. Also a simple correlation coefficient (Pearson's product-moment) was calculated to measure or assess the nature and strength of the relationship between motivation and retention. A regression analysis was carried out on the construct from the reliability test for the purpose of testing the validity and reliability of the study's two (null and alternative) hypotheses: H_0 : *Motivation is a key element to employee retention, and*; H_1 : *Motivation is NOT a key element to employee retention*. The test statistics was computed using the SPSS Package's Reliability, Regression and Correlation function on the combined data or responses from both non-managers and managers. The values of the regression and correlation coefficients and the ANOVA table were imported directly from SPSS.

a. Correlation Analysis

To test the strength of the relationship between the independent variable (motivation) and the dependent variable (employee retention), the Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was used for each of 33 questions forming the six categories. To achieve this, the responses for all the 30 respondents (managers and non-managers) were grouped into six core categories. The SPSS output shown on Table 1 below indicates that the Cronbach's Alpha score for the questions forming the first category was .586, second category was .797, third category was .223, fourth category was .629, fifth category was .704, and sixth category was .879. The correlation coefficients for the first, second, fourth, fifth, and sixth categories were calculated. However, the correlations coefficient for the third category of question was not computed since it had a low Cronbach's Alpha score of .223 which indicates a low level of consistency between the items (questions) being tested. This means that, comparatively, support services do not play a major role in influencing the employee retention within the case study organisation.

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha for the constructs

Section No	Construct	Dimensions	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Clear roles for team	3	0.892
2	Personal development	3	0.797
3	Support and opportunities		
4	Engagement(Retention)	4	0.629
5	Staff satisfaction	4	0.704
6	Compensation	7	0.879

As Table 2 below shows, the correlation analysis was based on the individual scores (responses) for each of the five core aspects of employee motivation, that is, team roles, personal development, employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and employee compensation. To allow for objective testing, the correlation analysis was based on two-tailed tests, meaning that the correlation between the independent and dependent variables was tested for both directions, that is, positive and negative directions from the significant level or either 0.01 and 0.05.

Table 2: Correlations Analysis

		Correlations					
		Team roles	Development	Engagement	Satisfaction	Compensation	
Team roles	Pearson Correlation	1	-.067	-.052	.095	.085	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.724	.785	.619	.656	
	N	30	30	30	30	30	
Development	Pearson Correlation	-.067	1	.638**	.273	.497	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.724		.000	.144	.005	
	N	30	30	30	30	30	
Engagement	Pearson Correlation	-.052	.638**	1	.273	.532**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.785	.000		.144	.002	
	N	30	30	30	30	30	
Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.095	.273	.273	1	.074	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.619	.144	.144		.697	
	N	30	30	30	30	30	
Compensation	Pearson Correlation	.085	.497**	.532**	.074	1**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.656	.005	.002	.697		
	N	30	30	30	30	30	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table 2 above there is a positive correlation between team roles on one hand, and employee satisfaction and employee compensation on the other, with regards to employee retention in the case study organisation as denoted by positive correlations of .095 and .085, respectively. There is also a negative correlation between team roles, personal development and engagement as denoted by negative correlations of -.067 and -.052 respectively. Although, these relationships may be weak as indicated by their low values, but positive in the sense that both variables increase and decrease simultaneously while negative correlation imply that an increase in one variable is associated with a decrease of the other variable. It is equally important to point out that the highest value of a correlation coefficient is ± 1 . A 2-tailed specifies how statistically significant a correlation between variables is. That is, increase or decrease in one variable does or does not significantly relate to increase or decrease of the other variable. When significant (2-tail) values are less than or equal to 0.05, the conclusion is always that there is a statistically significant correlation between the variables (Cochran, 2007; Saldana, 2012). Therefore, the high significant levels in almost all the correlation boxes can be interpreted to mean that a change in one variable may not necessarily indicate a change in the other as they relate to employee retention in the case study organisation. This means that each of the five motivation variables has a somehow independent influence on employee retention. However, the purpose of this study is to measure how these variables collectively influence employee retention and not how individual variable influences employee retention, this independent influence was not measured.

The above claim on engagement and retention can further be supported by the works of Jeswani and Souren (2008). As pointed out in chapter two above, engagement is necessary for employees' retention, and so, the researcher can comfortably argue that the motivation factors considered in this research that are correlated with staff engagement are invariably correlated with retention. Again, a strong link between engagement and retention was also pointed out by Siegfried Jr (2008) in chapter two, as the bottom line for people that enjoy what they do. An extension of these links shows the relationship between retention and the motivational factors considered in the case study organisation of this work. Therefore, the low significant level between personal development and engagement (.000), personal development and compensation (.005), and engagement and compensation (.002) can be interpreted to mean that a change in either of the variables in each of these three pairs may occasion a change of the other variable in the same pair as they relate to employee retention in the case study organisation. Lastly, the correlation between these three pairs of predictor variables is more

pronounced given the relatively low significant level (2-tailed) of 0.01 compared to other pairs whose significant level (2-tailed) is at 0.05.

Similarly, the matrix of correlation between factors or the six constructs is showing that compensation and personal development are most correlated with others. The fact that compensation' correlation is not very strong is in line with Maria Paviour's talk on employee engagement: *We need to look at the way we reward and pay people, because we know through research that bigger bonuses do not motivate. In fact, bonuses crush creativity: the bigger the bonus, the worse the performance* (IDS HR in Practice, 2013). For personal development whose correlation coefficient appears high and stronger with engagement is in line with Steers & Porter (1983), argument with regard to employees developing to their full potential; Failure to provide proper climate that supports employees' fullest potential development would increase employees' frustration and amounts to poorer performance, lower job satisfaction and increased withdrawal,(Steers & Porter, 1983a).

4.2 Regression Analysis

SPSS package was used to compute the regression analysis which describes statistical relationship between the independent and dependent variables. This analysis used the ANOVA (analysis of variance) framework that captures the statistical relationship between the outcome variable and the predictor variables. Again, the analysis was carried out along the five categories of questions highlighted earlier.

Table 3a: ANOVA

ANOVA ^a					
Model		Sum of Squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean Square	F
1	Regression	14.096	4	3.524	5.911
	Residual	14.904	25	.596	
	Total	29.000	29		

As Table 3a above shows, the F-value for the statistical relationship between the dependent variable (engagement) and predictor variables (constant, compensation, satisfaction, team roles, and personal development) is 5.911. The F-value was used to capture the appropriateness of the regression model in testing the statistical relationship between the dependent and predictor variables. Like the preceding analyses, the F-value was computed using the SPSS package 21. In this regard, an F-value of 5.911, this indicates a relatively low chance of some of the regression parameters being zeros or that the statistical relationship between the predictor variables and the outcome variable is not purely random. Further, a very small difference between the regression value of 14.096 and residual value of 14.904 indicates that there is a very small difference between what was expected and what was observed in the study. This also supports the appropriateness of the regression model in analysing the data. The error sum of square (residual) is calculated by deducting sum of square due to regression from the total sum of square that is 29.00-14.096=14.904. Again, a measure of the unexplained variation in Y (engagement) after regressing or explaining Y on X can be calculated by simply dividing the error sum of square by n-k (30-5=25). Statistically, this can be represented thus $\sigma^2 = 14.904/25 = 0.596$, as can be seen on the above table.

Table 3b: ANOVA

ANOVA ^a		
Model		Sig.
1	Regression	.002
	Residual	
	Total	

a. Dependent Variable: Engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation, Satisfaction, Team roles, Personal Development

As Table 3b above shows, the significance level for the statistical relationship between the dependent variable (engagement) and predictor variables (constant, compensation, satisfaction, team roles, and personal development) is .002. This indicates that the strong statistical relationship between the predictor variables and the outcome variable is valid. Even without extending the test to Turkey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test for Post hoc comparisons of mean effects when there is statistical significance as in this case, the regression coefficients in Table 3a below shows that Personal development contributes more towards

employees' retention (Engagement) as other predictor variables are held fixed, followed by Compensation with regression coefficients of 0.445 and 0.306 respectively.

Table 4a: Regression Coefficients

Coefficients ^a				
Model		Un-Standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
		B	Std. Error	Beta
1	(Constant)	-1.003E-013	.141	
	Team roles	-.061	.146	-.061
	Personal Development	.445	.174	.445
	Satisfaction	.135	.151	.135
	Compensation	.306	.168	.306

Table 4a above shows Beta values that are less than 1 for all the predictor variables. This indicates a very low volatility in the statistical relationship between the predictor variables (team roles, personal development, satisfaction, and compensation) and the outcome variable (engagement). Team role has the lowest likelihood of volatility with a Beta-value of -.061 while personal development has the highest likelihood of volatility with a Beta-value of .445.

Table 4b: Regression Coefficients

Coefficients ^a			
Model		t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.000	1.000
	Team roles	-.416	.681
	Personal Development	2.556	.017
	Satisfaction	.895	.379
	Compensation	1.824	.080

a. Dependent Variable: Engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation, Satisfaction, Team roles, Personal Development

As Table 4b above shows, when “engagement” is the dependent variable, the significance level for the predictor variable “team roles” is .681, “personal development” is .017, “satisfaction” is .379 and “compensation” is .080. This shows that employee retention has a very strong statistical relationship with employee engagement and team roles, personal development, satisfaction, and compensation. However, team roles variable has the highest relationship with employee engagement of .681 at a .002 significance level.

Table 5: Demographic Information

Employment position	Managers	16.7%
	Non-managers	83.3%
Age distribution	21-30	23.3%
	31-40	46.7%
	41-50	26.7%
	51-60	3.3%
Length of service	4-5yrs	26.7%
	Over 6yrs	73.3%
Gender	Male	34.54%
	Female	65.46%

V. DISCUSSION

The descriptive statistics results, for instance, indicate that the case study organisation enjoys relatively low levels of employee turnover. This is denoted by the fact that the greatest chunk of the employees (73.3%) have worked for the case study organisation for more than six years while the remaining portion (26.7%) has worked for between four and five years (*See table 5 above*). This finding is enhanced by the fact that a greater chunk of these employees (97%) work on a full-time employment basis. The fact that a majority of these employees (70%) are young people aged between 21 and 40 years, an age group that according to Masibigiri

and Nienaber (2011) is known to be liable to move in search of better employment opportunities, can be interpreted to mean that the high level of employee retention enjoyed by the case study organisation is not as a result of the age of individual employees.

One of the major attributes that form a good employee motivation includes team working. This finding is drawn from the regression analysis on Table 4a above which shows Beta values that are less than 1 for all the predictor variables. Analytically, Beta values that are less than 1 indicate a very low volatility in the statistical relationship between the predictor variables (team roles, personal development, satisfaction, and compensation) and the outcome variable (engagement). Team role has the lowest likelihood of volatility with a Beta-value of -.061 while personal development has the highest likelihood of volatility with a Beta-value of .445. This means that team roles have the highest impact on employee retention while personal development has the lowest impact. Further, and as Table 2 above shows, employee retention is strongly related to employee satisfaction and team roles and satisfaction given the .681 and .397 significant level, respectively. However, the relationship between employee retention and personal development and compensation is not as strong though given the .017 and .080 significant levels, respectively. In this regard, the case study organisation will most likely enhance her employee retention prospects if organisation invests more in team working, job flexibility and enrichment, and allows employees to proactively take part in the operational, tactical and strategic activities of the organisation. While drawing from the reviewed literature in chapter two above (see for example, Bloom & Berinato, 2014, Branch, 2011, Cran, 2012), it is arguable that team working can be enhanced by sharing objectives among team members, encouraging discussions about team effectiveness among team members, keeping a two-way communication channel and allocating teams responsibilities that stimulate their interests and skills.

VI. CONCLUSION

The above findings show that all the study objectives were achieved. Motivation was found to be a core factor that determines the level of employee retention among managers and non-managers within the case study organisation. Majority of the respondents were found to have spent more than three years working for the case study organisation. As expected, this finding was in tandem with the reviewed literature where it emerged that highly motivated employees have high job engagement levels, are more likely to handle challenging workplace tasks, are less likely to engage themselves in conflicts, and are most likely to work for a single organisation for a long time without considering to move in search for better employment terms. Specifically, future studies should seek to expand on this study area on other public organizations across the nation.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adam, M., Elizabeth, M., Grace, C., Keenan, C., David, L., & Karen, L. (2007). Impact and the art of motivation maintenance: The effects of contact with beneficiaries on persistence behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 103, pp. 53-67.
- [2]. Ashby, F., & Pell, A. (2001). *Embracing Excellence*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [3]. Ayers, K. E. (2008). Purpose-Centered Work. *Personal Excellence*, 13 (9), pp. 12-12.
- [4]. Barber, T. (2009). Inspire employee, especially in hard times, to benefit the whole organisation. *Nonprofit Business Advisor* (235), pp. 6-6.
- [5]. Bloom, N., & Berinato, S. (2014). To Raise Productivity Let More Employee Work from Home. *Harvard Business Review*, 92 (1/2), pp. 28-29.
- [6]. Branch, D. (2011). Employee motivation, Recognition, Rewards, and Retention: Kicking It Up a Notch! *CPA Practice Management Forum*, 7 (11), pp. 5-7.
- [7]. Breslin, M. M. (2013, August). Retention Strategies Need To Be Re-Engineered. *Workforce Management*, 92 (8), pp. 6-6.
- [8]. Cochran, W. G. (2007). *Sampling Techniques*. India: Wiley India Pvt Limited.
- [9]. Cohen, L., Marion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- [10]. Cran, C. (2012). Top 10 Employee Retention Strategies. *Managing People at Work* (369), pp. 6-16.
- [11]. Cristescu, A., Stanila, L., & Andreica, M. E. (2013). Motivation of the public employee in Romania in the context of the economic crisis. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 20 (10), 49-64.
- [12]. Delfgaauw, J. & Dur, R. (2008). Incentives and Worker's Motivation in the Public Sector. *Economic Journal*, 118 (525), 171-191.
- [13]. Dermody, M., Young, M., & Taylor, S. (2004). *Identifying Job Motivation factors of Difference: Efficiency wages, Public Service Motivation and Effort*.
- [14]. Drost, E. (2010). Employee's Intent to Remain With an Organisation: Empirical Evidence from Isreal. *Advances in Management*, 3 (1), 47-53.
- [15]. Gagne, M. & Deci, E. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of organisational behaviour*, 26, 331-362.
- [16]. IDS HR in Practice (2013, October) Q&A: ' If you want a more productive workforce, you need to have people who are emotionally engaged'. (J. Robertson, Ed.) *IDS HR in Practice*, 3
- [17]. Jeswani, S., & Souren, S. (2008). Integrating Talent Engagement as a Strategy to High Performance and Retention. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 4 (4), 14-23.
- [18]. Kontoghiorghes, C. & Frangrou, K.(2009) The Association between talent retention, antecedent factors and consequent organisational performance. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 74 (1), 1-10.
- [19]. Kumar, R., & Arora, R. (2012). Determinants of Talent Retention in BPO Industry. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48 (2), 259-273.

- [20]. Kuvaas, B. (2008). 'An exploration of how the employee–organization relationship affects the linkage between perception of developmental human resource practices and employee outcomes'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45 (1), 1-25.
- [21]. Lawler, E., & Suttle, J. L. (1973). Expectancy Theory and Job Behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 9, 482-503.
- [22]. Manion, J. (2005). *From management to leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [23]. Marius, M. & Radu, C. (2009). A Comparative Approach on the Motivational Dominants and Professional Performance of the Employees belonging to Public and Private Organisations. *Young Economist Journal*, 7 (13), 61-70.
- [24]. Masibigiri, V., & Nienaber, H. (2011). Factors affecting the retention of Generation X public servants: An exploratory study. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9 (1), 44-54.
- [25]. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50 (4), 370-396.
- [26]. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- [27]. Meyer, J., Topolnnytsky, L., Krajewski, H., & Gellantly, I. (2003). *Best Practices: Employee Retention*. Toronto: Tomson-Carswell.
- [28]. Miller, J. (1980). Individual and Occupational Determinants of Job Satisfaction work and occupation.
- [29]. O'Malley, M. (2000). *Creating Commitment: How to Attract and Retain Talented Employees by Building Relationship that Last* (Vol. 1). New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- [30]. Parry, E. (2009). *Employers must nurture talent to save costs*. Cranfield School of Management. London: E.learning age.
- [31]. Parry, E. (2009). Employers must nurture talent to save costs. *e.learning age* , pp. 4-4.
- [32]. People Management (2008, Dec 6). Make motivating factors work in your favour. *People Management*, 14 (12), pp. 52-52.
- [33]. Rowson, P. (2009, October). Attracting, Motivating and Retaining Talent in the Public Sector- A National Priority. *PA Times*, pp. 4-8.
- [34]. Saldana, J. (2012). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publication Limited.
- [35]. Scott, D. (2012, October). Keeping the best: 11 ways to retain key talent. *HR Specialist Compensation & Benefits*, 7 (10), pp. 5-5.
- [36]. Siegfried Jr, R. (2008). Mapping a Career Path for Attracting & Retaining Talents. *Financial Executives*, 24 (9), 52-55.
- [37]. Smith, G. (2001). *Here Today, Here Tomorrow*. Dearbon Trading Publishing .
- [38]. Steers, R. & Porter, L. (1983a). *Motivation and Work Behaviour* (3 ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [39]. Taylor, J. & Taylor, R. (2011). *Working Hard for More Money or Working Hard to make money*.
- [40]. Ting, Y. (1997). Determinants of Job satisfaction of federal government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 26 (3).
- [41]. Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.