

Study of Factors Affecting the Survival of the Organization's Human Resources

Seyed Ali Bigdeli¹, Mohammad Shirazi Pour², Mehdi Mobini³

^{1,2}Payame Noor University, PO BOX 19395-3697, Tehran, IRAN

³Allamatabatabei University, Tehran, IRAN

ABSTRACT

One of the most important tasks of the Human Resource Management (HRM) is employee retention. Hence, turnover rate is used to evaluate the HRM's performance, and it is considered to be ok where the turnover rate is normal. However there exists another side for the coin which has got a lot to do with the reasons why the employees remain in the organization. By no doubt, the employee retention backed by any likely (weak) reason is not of value for the management. There would be no more tension for the managers in this case used by some justified reasons coming into force for the employees to remain in the organization. In other words, the management performance has been considered to be perfect to the level of motivational factors being influential in this regard. Three main types of factors are identified and analyzed in this paper to influence the employee retention, naming motivational factors (job satisfaction), internal environmental factors, and lastly external environmental factors. Findings show that internal environmental factors, external environmental factors, and finally motivational factors influence the employee's retention in the decreasing order. Moreover, the influence of motivational factors from one side and the external environmental factors from the other side is reversely associated. That is, the more the influence of motivational factors on the employee retention decreases, the more the influence of the external environmental factors on the employee retention increases. It means that many of those unsatisfied of their job remain in the organization longer, just due to being forced to do so because of the external environmental factors. If it is so, then it would not be an ideal stand for the organization management. Moreover, the research findings show that the management performance in employee retaining has not been optimum. Therefore, it is necessary to make the motivational factors playing more active role.

KEYWORDS: Organization retention, motivational factors, internal environmental factors, external environmental factors.

INTRODUCTION

One of the principal duties as always weights on the human-resource managements' shoulder is the optimum retaining of manpower in organizations. Beach of duty index is applied as one of the most acknowledged ones in evaluation of the human-resource managements' performance in both institutions and organizations; by its standard level, the management's performance would be included as optimum. However, this paper intends to review aforementioned subject from this viewpoint of the reasons why those staffs are retained in organization as well as whether they can be considered as optimum or not. Anyway, classifying the synthesis of above-mentioned reasons and directing them towards utility are principal tasks of human-resource managements.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Always, one can find in management literature the emphasis on attribution of high breach of duty rate to non-optimum organizational managements' performance in manpower retaining. Therefore, managers constantly try to maintain this rate as possible low even closer to zero. If so, they will handle their duties having peace in their mind. Rather, it is different in reality. Eventually, low breach of duty rate composes just one-half of the case. In other words, managers are responsible to the synthesis of staff retention reasons and if it is optimum along with considering the breach of duty rate and arranging it in standard level.

More precisely, the more effective motivational and secondary internal factors and the less affecting external factors are on employee's retention; it can be argued fresher and more spiritedly employees will

be in organization. Thereupon, the current article tends to clarify the synthesis of staffs retention reasons, surveying the relationship between motivational and external environment factors on manpower retention, and their relationship with staffs retention in different skill levels.

This study put the staff retention subject matter under the different scope, which may be overlooked in past and reminds managers those staffs retained by the stress of external environment factors and having fewer roles of internal environment factors are riskier than those breach of their duty. In fact, organization pays loss once for those who breach of their duty; yet, they cause contiguous loss if owing non-acknowledgeable synthesis of retention reasons. Then studying the staff retention reasons seems to be significant and inevitable.

The subject matter of effective factors on cadres retention is deeply rooted background. Here below, some of the pertaining studies are mentioned:

Sunil Ramlall [1] attempted to incorporate motivational theories in order to reach justification, of how they could affect on personnel retaining. Study mentioned a report by the Bureau of National Affairs (1998) in which the breach of duty rate reached to its highest possible point in organizations until then. Moreover, it was argued that although many retaining plans had been executed; mostly, they were not based on effective theories. Besides, it was reminded based on what Hale quoted that 86% of bosses had to meet difficulties with employing new staffs and %58 of organizations announced that staff retention had been a relatively hard task. Shelly Langan, mentioned average four years of retaining period in a job based on a report by the Bureau of National Affairs. This research claimed that nowadays job security was not principal perturbation for most of the employees and job volunteers [2]. In a study about truck drivers, researchers concluded that minor companies (less than 50 full time drivers) had been more successful in retaining personnel comparing with major ones. Thereupon, it is concluded that applying more various approaches of staff retention is significant for major companies. In addition, the effects of other factors, including drivers' age, and their part-time or full time forms of working on it are studied as well in this research [3]. In another paper, retention qualified employees was regarded as one of the organizational capabilities; and related difficulties, costs, and approaches were examined. Besides, of those factors mentioned by other researches; involving employees in decision-makings was accounted as an effective factor in rising job satisfaction that could lead to retaining employees in organization. Effects made by competent staffs on the rest were another worth noting point in this paper. Finally, the claim that some of the qualified employees are not capable of having positive effects on the rest was examined [4]. Breach of duty rate in different industries in composed another study in which the breach of duty rate in textile industry of Britain was explained [6]. Mulhern expressed the importance of flowing communications in organization, especially between staffs and managers, and emphasized that if the managers' replies to questions like:

- Have you applied completely acknowledged approach for solving staffs' objections?
- Do you have planned meetings with staffs to deal with their problems and affairs?

If the answer is negative, then it is necessary to study and make effective efforts preventing them to become serious problems [7].

The concept of "employees' life cycle" can be found in reading between lines of another investigation. Based on this researcher's idea, effective management of the mentioned cycle could be lead-in to increasing the coefficient of staffs' retention [8]. Retention of Medical jobholders was allocated special survey to examine effective factors that retain these specialists in their jobs or organization [9]. An investigation discovered that task environment could affect on either retaining or breach of the organization; although managers are less categorical in this study comparing with staffs and rather emphasize other factors (except environment) as effective ones [10].

An article indicates to the various researches that show if employees understand well what are expected from them, know why they should handle them, feeling what they are managed to do; or if there could be a desirable future in that job, then they are more tended to retain in that organization [11]. Karen schweizer concluded in this regards that if organization uses competent employees induce sufficient motivation and do not impose them intolerable tasks, provide them training, designs favorable payment system compared with competitors, then more personnel's retention could be yielded [12]. Harkness, Mai James, Lea expressed in their investigations that, below factors others play the most important roles in retaining employees and preventing them from breach of duty [13]: Job enlargement besides training, challenging, and interesting job, significant tasks, and feeling something are done for the organization, being a member of a group, having good chairmen, to be appreciated for optimum functions, and some The experiences of Knight Garage in reinforcing loyalty to the organization were listed in an article. Rational working time, payment sufficient for a comfortable life, favorable holidays, retirement benefit,

and flexible working time for young mothers and mothers, are included in those factors [14]. Organizational prevention from high breach of duty rate assisted by those factors mentioned in another research [15]:

- Optimum performance in employment;
- Concern amount to the type of job;
- Motivation and appropriate payment system;
- Training & making experiences during working;
- Job enlargement;
- Job satisfaction;
- Understanding organizational culture;
- Coordination with others and establishment of a confliction reconciliation system;
- Developed human-resource management;
- Conformity of company strategy through departments and between central office and under supervision units;
- Personal independence of employees;

Based on the aforementioned survey, these are the most important variables reinforcing the employees' retention in the environment of their organizations.

Some previous studies and related results were mentioned in a research background. Although, some of the effective factors and variables on retention were considered by them, significant relationship was remained unnoticed. In the current paper, all of these factors are defined more pervasive and classified into three motivational, internal, and external environment types. Moreover, some significant relationship is examined between research variables and by related results; the synthesis of employees' retention reasonis evaluated. Therefore, comprehensiveness of research variables and the relationship between them are those advantageous, which was tried to make. Triple variables of research are defined, and their indexes are explained here below: Motivational factors are somehow related to the persons' job. These include twelve indexes of: working time; duty variations; independence of approach selection; admiring the job fulfillment; job improvement; types and amount of responsibility; conformity of tasks with abilities; duty importance and their roles in the organizational success; attempt and mental activities amount; success in fulfillment of duties; awareness of function results, and having a significant job. Internal environment factors contain those parameters existed inside the organization as follows: making competent picture of oneself for other staffs, behavioral and superior attitude types, competency of incumbents in organizational decision-makings, job security, governing rules and regulations over organization, physical conditions of working environment, attitude types of colleagues, salary and benefit, organizational position and ranking, environment facilities, break time during working time.

The external environment factors are those parameters outside the organization that can affect on employees' retention, and divided into these twelve indices:

- 1) Concerning the region in which company is situated;
- 2) Not being interested to have to benefit in another company;
- 3) Distinguished as a competent person in society;
- 4) Family responsibilities;
- 5) Taking loan from company;
- 6) Appropriate behavior with personnel comparing with other companies;
- 7) Oldness and age;
- 8) Not accepting the risks of new job;
- 9) The problem of finding appropriate job;
- 10) Not being interested in learning rules of a new company;
- 11) Not being interested in finding job outside the organization;
- 12) And not being interested in leaving personal favorable friends

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research inquiries are:

- 1- What is the priority of motivational, internal, and external factor effectiveness on staffs' organizational retention in whole organization and its different levels?
In this regards, all company staffs were classified into four groups of managers and specialists, semi, none and skilful technical experts. The criterion was organizational chart and table

classification of jobs reallocation. Then sample members of each classification were selected regarding the total size of sampling and by random numbers.

Sample Size: at first, 100 individuals were defined and were selected through approach item A, and questionnaires were distributed.

Then making sure of sample size sufficiency, the criteria deviation was calculated, and finally, sample size was computed by the following formula:

$$n \geq \frac{N \cdot \frac{z^2 \alpha}{2} \delta^2}{d^2} \div \left((N - 1) + \frac{z^2 \alpha}{2} / 2 \delta^2 \right)$$

Here, 1- α denotes evaluation assurance, δ defines society criteria deviation, N is the total size of sampling society, and d expresses maximum allowed error. Evaluation assurance in above formula is %95; in other words %95 assurances to the calculated mean of sample are that real society mean. The error rate of this formula (based on statistical consultant's opinion) is threemeanings that maximum difference of evaluated average with its real amount is 3, which is ignorable. Moreover, as the society deviation was not cleared, the sample deviation rate, 16.1, was applied. So,

$$n \geq \frac{519 \cdot \frac{(1.96 \times 16.1)^2}{9}}{518 + \frac{(1.96 \times 16.1)^2}{9}} \cong 92$$

For more assurances, the result of formula was considered by %10 rises, and the sample size increased into 101. As 100 questionnaires were distributed at first, then another one was delivered.

Data collection tools:questionnaire was used in this paper in order to gather data. It contained 36 questions, the first 12 of which were related to motivational factors; the second 12 questions were related to internal environment factors; and the third 12 ones were related to external ones.

Authenticity & validity of data collection tools:its authenticity was studied by Delphi approach. A sample of the questionnaire was sent to some professors and experts in order to inform their ideas aboutquestions and the ways answering to them. A series of ideas was collected and by being modified, was sent again. By the final revision, the last modifications were done. Its validity was examinedby selecting a sample of 60 items, and below resultswas obtained by inter section method:

- 1-Alpha coefficient for the first part: 87%
- 2-Alpha coefficient for the second part: 93%
- 3-Alpha coefficient for the third part: 87%

Table 1- variance analysis of triple factors effects on organizational retention of all staff

Scatter source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of square roots	Mean of square roots	F	Level of significance
Approach	2	78/4547	89/2273	40/34	0/00001
Line	300	53/19826	08/66		
Total	302	31/24374			

Table 2- variance analysis of triple factors effects on organizational retention of managers & experts

Scatter source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of square roots	Mean of square roots	F	Level of significance
Approach	2	1670/02	835/01	13/96	0/00001
Line	66	3947/73	59/81		
Total	68	5617/75			

Data analysis methods: three statistical techniques were applied for data analysis; First, variance analysis test was used in order to examine if there could be a significant relationship between mean of variable effects on individuals' retention in organization or not. Second, L.S.D test was done in order to define the most effective factor between them. Moreover, chi-square test was done for studying if there could be found significant relationship between skill levels and motivational factors effects (job satisfaction) beside the former and external environment one. It is necessary to remark that in variance analysis and L.S.D tests, μ_1 , μ_2 , μ_3 denoted the mean of motivational, internal environment and external effects on retention of personnel.

Founding analysis:

- 1- What is the priority of motivational, internal environment and external environment effects on organizational retention of personnel in the whole organization and its different levels?

Variance analysis was performed in order to compare means of these factor effects on personnel retention.

As one can observe in the table (1), the assumption of significant difference between at least two variables can be accepted. The results of the L.S.D test show that $\mu_2 > \mu_3$ and $\mu_3 > \mu_1$ meaning that internal environment, external environment and motivational factors are attributed the first to the third ranking in order.

Variance analysis test was performed to compare the means of these three factors effects on managers and experts.

Table (2) denotes that there could be found at least two significant differences between the means of these triple factors. Furthermore, based on the results of L.S.D test, we have $\mu_2 > \mu_1$ and $\mu_1 > \mu_3$. Therefore, in managers and experts groups, internal environment, motivational (job satisfaction) and external environment factors are the first to the third rankings, orderly. Variance analysis test was performed for comparison of motivational, internal environment, and external environment factors effects on the organizational retention of clerical staffs. Table 3 indicates that the mean difference test of these three factors was significant; meaning that at least the mean effects of two factors have significant relationship with each other. In addition, L.S.D test shows that $\mu_2 > \mu_3$ and $\mu_3 > \mu_1$; again internal environment factor is the most effective one in retention of this group. The only difference between staffs group with managers and experts is that the motivational (job satisfaction) in the staff group is the third one and has the least role in retaining of this group. The variance analysis test was performed in professional personnel too, which its results were presented in table 4.

Table 3- variance analysis of triple factors effects on organizational retention of clerical & administrative staffs

Scatter source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of square roots	Mean of square roots	F Significance	
Approach	2	1736/94	868/47	18/59	0/00001
Line	63	2942/81	46/71		
Total	65	4679/75			

Table 4- variance analysis of triple factors effects on organizational retention of technical experts staffs

Scatter source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of square roots	Mean of square roots	F significance
Approach 0/0477	2	375/85	187/92	3/19
Line	63	2942/81	58/81	
Total	65	4679/75		

Table 5- variance analysis of triple factors effects on organizational retention of semi & non-professional staffs

Scatter source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of square roots	Mean of square roots	F significance	
Approach	2	3276/41	1638/20	26/01	0/00001
Line	99	6234/29	62/93		
Total	101	9510/70			

Table four, shows the mean difference test is again significant in the related group. The result of L.S.D test is $\mu_2 > \mu_1$. Therefore, it is just the relationship between internal environment and motivational factors (job satisfaction) that their significant relationship can be proven. It can be argued that internal environment factor is more effective than the motivational factor on the persons' retention. The results of variance analysis test in semi and non- professional personnel can be observed in table 5. As table five shows, the assumption of significant relationship between the mean effects of at least two variables can be accepted. L.S.D test also presented the following results: $\mu_2 = \mu_3$; $\mu_3 > \mu_1$; $\mu_2 > \mu_1$

Despite the significant relationship between internal environment and external environment factors in comparison with motivational factor, but such a variance does not exist between themselves. Thus, we can argue that internal and external environment factors allocated the first ranking in their effects on the employees' retention; then motivational factor is attributed as the second one.

2- Is there any significant relationship between motivational (job satisfaction) factor and the personnel's skill levels?

Table six, classifies four folds groups into two categories based on the motivational factor effect.

The test results imply that the assumption of significant relationship between these two variables can be approved. The range of this relationship is computed by the coefficient of contingency, which merely equals to 0.31.; in other words, just 31% of changes in motivational factor effects are originated from alteration in skill levels and the rest from other factors.

Table 6- Contingent table of motivational factor effect in comparison with skill level staffs

Skill level percentage	Effects of motivational factors On organizational retention	low to average		average to high	
		(score) 0-24		(score) 25-48	
		Frequency	percentage	Frequency	
Semi & non-professional staffs	34	28	82.35	6	17.65
Technical expert staffs	22	13	59.09	9	40.91
22 clerical & administrative staffs	7	31.82	22	15	68.18
Managers & specialists	23	10	43.48	13	56.52
Total	101		66	35	
P<0.023 coefficient	0= expected frequency percentage smaller than 5; X ² =9.658	Q=0.309	contingency		

Table 7- Contingent table of external environment factor effect in comparison with skill level staffs

		Effects of external env.factors		low to average		average to high	
		On organizational retention		(score) 0-24	(score) 25-48		
Skill level percentage	Total			Frequency	percentage	Frequency	
		Semi & non-professional staffs	34	9	26	25	74
Technical expert staffs	22	8	36	14	64		
22 clerical & administrative staffs	64			8	36		
14 Managers & specialists	23	20	87	3	13		
Total	101			56	45		

P<0.005 0= expected frequency percentage smaller than 5; $X^2=22.43$ Q=0.47 contingency coefficient

The orientation of relationship can be recognized through the percentage column of the table. In the semi-professional group, there can be found 82.35% of people were positioned in motivational factors effectiveness scores of 0-24; while it is equal to 43.48% in the managers group. Conversely, just 17.65% are placed in score range of 25-48; while it equals to 56.52 in the managers group. Therefore, it is obvious that the rate of job satisfaction effectiveness increases by growing the skill level.

3- Is there any significant relationship between external environment factors and skill level? Table (7), presents fourfold groups, which can be classified into two groups. Chi-square test was performed for studying the relationship between these two. The results showed that assumption of their significant relationship could be accepted. The contingency coefficient is 47%; in other words, 47% of square changes originated from external environment factors is the result of skill level modifications. Relationship orientation can be recognized by percentage inside the table. These percentages indicate that the higher skill level is, the less effective on external environment factors on employees' retention will be.

4- Is there significant relationship between organizational retention and external environment factors? Chi-square test was done for studying the relationship between motivational and external environment factors. Table (8) classifies fourfold groups of personnel based on different levels of motivational and external environment effects.

Table 8- Contingent table of motivational factor in comparison with external environment factor

Motivational factor		external environment factor (based on scores)				
(Based on scores)		(score) 0-24		(score) 25-48		Total
		Frequency	percentage	Frequency	percentage	
0-24	66	23	34.85	43	65.15	
25-48	35	22	62.86	13	37.14	
Total	101	45		56		

P<0.0007 0= expected frequency percentage smaller than 5; $X^2=7.263$ Q=0.278 contingency coefficient

The test results indicate the assumption of significant relationship can be accepted. Contingency coefficient shows their correlation rate equal to 0.268; meaning that merely 27% of external environment change is originated from motivational factor change.

Moreover, their relationship direction is inverted; then the more job satisfaction increase, the more external environment factor will decline in a way that about 65% of those who are not satisfied with their

jobs, gained high scores of external environment effects while 63% of job holders satisfied with their job have fewer scores in this regards.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Variance analysis test shows that internal environment, external environment and motivational factors are orderly the most effective ones in personnel retention at the level of company.

In managers and specialists group, internal environment, motivational and external factors are in order, the first to the third ranking based on their effects on employees' retention.

In clerical and motivational group, internal environment, external environment and motivational factors are orderly the first to the third ranking.

In technical expert staffs, there is significant relationship just between internal environments, motivational factors in a way that effects of the internal environment factors were more than motivational one.

Finally, in semi and non- professional staffs, internal and external environment factors are attributed to the first ranking, and motivational factor is the second.

In company level, if the internal environment factor was the first ranking, it can be argued convincingly that most of the organizational staffs were obliged to retain more than they like to. Although there is not such certainty at the right moment, but the preference of internal environment effects, especially external environment ones doesn't provide a desirable picture of organizational retention management. More precise looking into the sample ranking, make this fact more visible that mostly organization staffs retain more by the pressure of environment factors; either internal or external ones.

Motivational factors are acceptable just in managers and specialists groups that indicate human-resource management retention have not optimum performance. Moreover, founding analysis reveals that effective rate of job satisfaction has direct relationship with the skill level. There are different reasons, including job variations, independent function, and power of decision-making. Definitely, managers and specialists have more authority in this regards comparing with lower levels.

There is inverse relationship between skill levels and external environment factors. L.S.D test results support the relationship between skill levels and motivational; skill level and external environment factors.

A review on these results discovers the most effects was made by job satisfaction (motivational) on individuals' retention in managers and specialists group; while it made the least effect in other groups. These results are presented in tables 6 and 7. Table 6 suggests the preference of job satisfaction in managers and specialists group; table seven exhibit the preference of external environment to the other three groups. Therefore, it can be argued that many of organization employees retain by the pressure of internal and external environment factors. In addition, inverse relationship of motivation and external environment factors on staffs' retention is noticeable; in other words, the more job satisfaction increase, the less powerful environment factors in staffs' retention will be. As the conclusion, one can claim that a great deal of jobholders that are dissatisfied with job retention in organization just by external environment reasons. In fact, it cannot be good news. In such a case, employees cannot be creative and progressive in working. Moreover, as soon as finding a desirable opportunity, they would beach of their duty. Meanwhile, the results support this assumption the reasons why retained employees are not essentially in conflict with those who beached their duty. 43% of sample persons are in low level from the viewpoint of job satisfaction, while the external environment role in their retention is obvious. Precisely, they are in conditions that those beached their duty once were. Therefore, low does not necessarily imply neither staffs are satisfied with their job, nor the human-resource manager's performance is optimum in retaining employees. Test results revealed that motivational factors were less effective than environment ones. Besides, there was inverse relationship between motivational and external environment factors. Effective plantings can be possible based on these yields. In other words, it is intended to reduce power of external environment factors by executing different motivational plans. In this regards, low suggestions are more noteworthy:

- 1- Job enrichment: defined responsibilities should grant self-identity to the jobholder. Mostly, job dilution is assigned in a way that makes tasks too simple and nonsensical. Therefore, job enrichment and assigning satisfying responsibilities can be a method for the motivational increase.
- 2- Conformity of employees with the assigned jobs: Great deals of evidences show that motivation would be advantageous whenever proper and precise assignment is considered. For instance, if a manager for an independent department of a large company is required, a success seeker type of person should be selected; while an unoccupied management position in a bureaucratic organization requires a power seeker with low possessive orientation.

- 3- Goal assignment: managers should be sure that their staffs have defined clear goals meanwhile considering their progress rate. Moreover, staff's involvement in decision-making played important role in rising motivation. In fact, managers should make sure that their employees believe reaching to their goals by making attempt.
In another expression, employees should have the ability of performing tasks and validate evaluation progress by which their performance will be examined.
- 4- Reward personalization: as employees may feel different needs, rewards that could be reinforcing for one, could not be the same for another. Hence, managers should increase their knowledge about personal differences.
- 5- Rewards connection with performance: assigning rewards to factors other than performance would just reinforce those factors not essentially performance. Removing vague points about salary and announcing it can make rewards potentially motivational.
- 6- Improving physical factors include, making green spaces in industrial environment, sufficient light in working halls, noise reduction in working place, improving effective internal factors on retention of employees.

In fact, aforementioned suggestions can increase the power of motivational factors in order to reach an acceptable synthesis of organizational retaining factors. It is necessary to remind that whatever is correct or incorrect for management will not be the same for employees. Even, it is possible that something, which seems to be correct for a manager will not seem so for another one. Improving, both personnel planning and policies, appropriate to different worthseeming to be vitally important. Therefore, strategy development and reinforcing those factors, which because employees retain, based on rightful reason can be effective on his and the organization benefit as well.

REFERENCES

1. Sunil Ramlall (2004) A Review of Employee Motivation Theories and their Implications For Employee Retention within Organizations, The journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, September, pp. 52-64.
2. Langan Shelly (2000) Finding the needle in the haystack: the challenge of recruiting and retaining sharp employee, Public personnel Management, Vol.29, No. 4, Winter, pp.149-162.
3. Min Hokey and Emam A. (2003) Developing the profiles of Truck drivers for their Successful recruitment and Retention, International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp.149-162.
4. Singer, Kevin J. (1992) challenges of employee retentions, Management Research New, 22, 10; ABI/INFORM Global p.1.
5. Taplin Ian M., Winterton, Onnathan and Winterton Ruth (2003) Understanding Labor Turnover in a Labor Intensive Industry: Evidence from the British Clothing Industry, Journal of Management Studies, 40;4 June, 22-238.
6. McKinnon, Jill L., Harrison Graeme L., Chow Chee W. and Anne Wu (2003) Organization a culture: Association with commitment, job satisfaction, propensity to remain, and information sharing in Taiwan, International Journal of Business Studies; Vol. 11, No. 1, June, pp. 25-44.
7. Mulhern Barbara (2003) Retaining good employees, American Nurseryman, September 15, pp.39-42.
8. IOMA's Yearbook (2003) IOMA's Report on Salary Surveys, Managing Accounts Payable YEARBOOK.
9. Wynn, Paul (2005) Training, incentives help Practices retain employees, Cosmetic Surgery Times, October
10. ASAD (2000) WHY EMPLOYEES STAY--OR GO Facilities Design & Management, 02794438, Oct, Vol.19, Issue 10, pp.46-49.
11. Tony Silber and Folio (2001) Why employees, STAY The Magazine for Magazine Management, 00464333, 8/1/, Vol. 29, Issue 10.
12. Karen schweizer (2004) 24th Annual salary & Job Satisfaction Survey Food Engineering, Dec, Vol. 76, Issue 12, pp.32-36.
13. Harkness, Mai James, Lea (2001) Getting It, Communication World, Feb/Mar, Vol. 18, Issue 2, p.7.
14. Jenny king (1999) 10 years? That's a 'new hire' at knight deal, Automotive News, 02/08, Vol. 73 Issue, 5805, p. 92.
15. Tello, Greene Marco Polo, Walter E (1996) US managerial strategies and applications for retaining personnel in Mexico International Journal of Manpower, Vol. 17 Issue 8, 54.