



EFFECT OF EMPLOYEE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND TALENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON ACADEMIC STAFF RETENTION: A CASE OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA

Leonard N. Kiragu¹ Dr. Dinah J. Kipkebut², Dr. Simon Kipchumba³

¹*PhD student Department of Business Administration, Egerton University,
Email: kiraguh06@gmail.com*

²*Senior Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, Egerton University,
Email: jerutodiana@gmail.com*

³*Senior Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, Egerton University,
Email: kipchumba7@gmail.com*

Abstract: Many organizations globally, including universities in Kenya are engaged in the battle for the best talents. In this war for talent, the best organizations aim at improving their short and long term plans, policies and practices for the attraction, development, repositioning and enhancing retention of talents vital for their business needs. The objective of the present study is to examine the effects of demographic characteristics (age, gender, education, tenure as an academic, tenure in the current university and job position) and talent management practices (training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching) on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya. The sample of the study consisted of 388 academic staff drawn from a population of 13,441 academic staff in 31 public universities and 32 private universities in Kenya. Questionnaire method was used to collect data which was analysed using inferential statistics which included Independent Samples T Test, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Pearsons Correlation and Multiple Regression analysis. The results showed that biographical characteristics (gender and education) did not influence satisfaction with talent management practices and decision to remain in the university; Age, tenure as an academic, tenure in the current university and job position did not influence satisfaction with talent management practices; Age, tenure as an academic, tenure in the current university and job position had significant influence on retention of academic staff; level of education influenced satisfaction with mentoring programmes in the university; Talent management practices (training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching) had significant, positive effects on academic staff retention. The study recommends that universities should enact policies that promote talent management which will in turn promote sustainable academic staff retention and competitive advantage.

Keywords: Demographic Characteristics, Talent Management Practices, Retention, Universities.

Introduction

University academic staff attrition represents the loss of experienced employees especially where those who are leaving the profession are highly qualified academics. This may have the effect of leaving a less capable pool of staff in the lecture room as well as lead to demoralization among remaining academics (Selesho & Naile, 2014). Universities globally are facing challenges mainly due to severe budget cuts amid increasing student enrolment. Kenyan universities face similar staff turnover problems which have contributed to inefficiency and deterioration of academic standards (Losem, 2015).

Talent management refers to the general practice of developing, managing and retaining employees (Schuler, Jackson & Tarique, 2011). Talent management is about attracting, identifying, recruiting, developing, motivating, promoting and retaining employees with strong potential to succeed within the organization (Armstrong, 2007). Talented employees with high potential to an organization are more beneficial, more satisfied with their jobs and have lower rates of intentions to quit (Hornung, Rousseau & Weigl, 2010). A study by Oehley (2007) found that talent management competencies of attracting and recruiting talent have a significant negative effect on employees' intention to quit the organisation. Similarly, Du Plessis (2015) found a

significant negative relationship between employees' perception of the organisation's talent management practices and their intention to quit the organisation.

Talent management is founded on the idea that employees are an organization's most valued asset (Schuler et al., 2011). This is significant for both public and private universities as there is a drive towards competency and providing top quality service to students both inside and outside the lecture hall (Cobb, 2015). Universities cannot afford to lag behind in their talent practices and then expect to recruit and retain employees required to drive organization success. Putting in place a talent management plan which focuses on cultivating a culture based on performance helps drive efficiency, decrease turnover costs, nurture employee development and ensures higher level of services are accorded to students (Walsh and Taylor, 2007).

Reduction of academic staff attrition is a pertinent issue in Public and private Universities in Kenya because these institutions are operating in a highly competitive environment and hence depend on these staff for success and sustainability. Various studies have been conducted in Kenya to investigate factors influencing academic staff retention (Ng'ethe, 2012; Mugove & Mukanzi, 2018; Muimi, 2016). None of these studies have focused on the role of talent management practices in influencing academic staff retention which presents a knowledge gap on the need to investigate how other variables such as talent management practices can influence retention of academic staff in universities. This study therefore sought to provide empirical evidence on the effect of talent management practices on retention of academic staff in Kenyan Universities.

Statement of the Problem

The global interest in reduction of academic staff attrition has been prompted by factors such as the need to maintain quality of teaching in the universities so as to improve the quality of graduates from the universities and the need for continuous research (Amaral, Orlanda, Sonia and Cristina, 2016). Talent management practices are important predictors of workers' intention to stay or leave an organization. Supportive talent management practices indicate an organization's willingness to invest in human capital so as to enhance employee retention. Previous studies on talent Management practices found a negative relationship between talent management and employees' intention to quit (Ndungu and Omondi, 2015; Ngoben, 2015; Barkhuize, 2014) while other studies have found positive correlations between talent management and retention (Kibui, Gachunga and Namusonge, 2014; Chitsaz-Isfahani and Boustani, 2014). Therefore, the ability of talent management practices to enhance retention suggests that these practices are able to decrease employees' intention to quit the organization. Chitsaz-Isfahani and Boustani (2014) in a study of 280 respondents found that there was a positive and significant relationship between talent management practices and employee retention among employees in Isfahan University in Iran. Kissoonduth (2017) study entitled 'Talent Management: Attracting and retaining academic staff at selected public higher education institutions in South Africa', found a significant positive relationship between talent management practices and academic staff retention. Njanjobea (2016) in a sample of 65 academic staff found a significant relationship between talent management and retention among academic staff in Durban University of Technology, South Africa. There is however no research that has linked the demographic characteristics, talent management practices and retention of academic staff in universities in Kenya. This study therefore sought to provide an empirical evidence of the effect of demographic characteristics and talent management practices on retention of academic staff in chartered private and public universities in Kenya.

Literature review

The literature review will discuss various aspects of the study variables namely, demographic characteristics, talent management practices and retention.

Academic Staff Retention

Marchington & Wilkinson (2006) defines employee retention as measures taken to inspire employees to remain in the institutions they are working in for a long period of time. Reduction in turnover of talented workers in the universities which are considered as the hub of knowledge has become a core issue (Mubarak, Wahab and Khan, 2012). Global interest in reduction of academic staff attrition has been prompted by factors such as the need to maintain quality of teaching in the universities so as to improve the quality of graduates from the universities and the need for continuous research (Amaral, Orlanda, Sonia and Cristina, 2016). High rates of staff resignation

are expensive in terms of additional recruitment costs, loss of know-how and customer goodwill, lost production costs and increased cost of training.

Numerous studies have been conducted worldwide on the state of universities and all point out to a problem of academic staff attrition. May (2013) report that attrition rates in Australian universities were worryingly high with researchers estimating around 30% to 50% of lecturers leaving in the first five (5) years. Roser (2017) reported that Student-to-employee ratios in many countries have generally increased over the years. This clearly brings out the problem of academic staff attrition in institutions of higher learning. Bernard (2012) in a study of factors that determine academic staff retention and commitment in private tertiary institutions in Botswana found that academic staff recruitment and retention were affected by the whole employment package which include pay and fringe benefits, intrinsic aspects of the job, job security, work organization, autonomy, progression and working environment among other factors.

Selesho and Naile (2014) studied factors that influence retention rates of academic staff at selected universities in South Africa. The sample size was 80 academic staff who had worked at higher education institutions for more than 10 years. The study found that job satisfaction was the main factor keeping academic staff in their professions. In addition, job satisfaction was also linked to career growth and academic development. The study could not rule out the probabilities of working conditions as a factor influencing retention. Mugove and Mukanzi (2018) studied the determinants of employee turnover among 340 teaching and non-teaching staff in three public universities in Western region of Kenya. The study found job satisfaction, work environment and work flexibility had significant negative relationships with staff turnover. This means that turnover increased when university staff were dissatisfied with their jobs, work environment and lacked work flexibility.

Employee demographic characteristics

Several studies have been carried out to determine the effect of employee demographic characteristics on employee retention and intentions to turnover (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Kipkebut, 2010; Kipkebut, 2013; Ngigi and Kipkebut, 2014; Agyeman and Ponnaihi, 2014; Segbenya, 2014; Murupus and Kipkebut, 2015). Demographic characteristics include age, gender, race, and tenure among others (Rustiana and Rahmaningtyas, 2018). According to Gupta, Kumar and Seemarani (2015) demographic characteristics such as age, tenure, level of education, level of income, job category and gender among others cannot be ignored as they influence employee retention and turnover intention. Agyeman and Ponnaihi (2014) reported that demographic predictors (age, gender, tenure, education, and income levels) were predictors of retention and turnover intentions. Coetzee (2015) stated that understanding how retention factors may differ between employees with different demographic characteristics may contribute to knowledge on retention practices among diverse and multi-cultural workforce.

Segbenya (2014) in his study on the effects of demographic variables on employees' decisions to stay or quit in Ghana Commercial Bank, Kumasi, found that intentions to quit was high among mostly females, employees under the age of 35 years, employees in personal banking position, employees at the junior level of the bank and employees who had worked with the bank for less than 15 years. In their meta-analysis, Griffeth *et al.* (2000) found only a negligible difference between men and women in terms of turnover intentions with women being slightly more likely to leave their jobs than men. On the other hand, Jadoo *et al.* (2015) found that male employees were more likely to turnover than female employees. In case of age, the study revealed that younger employees were more likely to take risks at the beginning of their careers than older employees. They were also more likely to accept positions below their abilities and expectations at the beginning of their career and were always on a move to better opportunities. Griffeth *et al.* (2000) found negative age-turnover relationship. This study therefore seeks to determine whether age, gender, level of education, tenure as an academic, tenure in the university and current position will have significant effect on talent management practices and academic staff retention.

The demographic characteristics to be investigated in this study in relation to talent management practices and retention are age, gender, tenure as an academic, tenure in the current university, education and job position.

Age: Studies have found a significant relationship between age and employee retention (Ahuja et al, 2007; Borman and Dowling, 2017). Younger employees have a higher probability of leaving than older employees (Achoui and Mansour, 2007). In a study with sample size of 297 managers and staff working in a total of ten

five-star hotels in Istanbul, Emiroğlu et al. (2015) found that older workers in the age groups 46-55 and 56 years and over had lower turnover intentions than young employees who were in lower age groups (26-30 years).

Gender: Studies have found conflicting results in the relationship between gender and retention. In a survey of 377 academic staff in Malaysian private universities, Choong *et al* (2013) found that females had a higher intention to quit as compared to male academic staff. On the other hand, Obwoyere and Kipkebut (2016) found that there were no gender differences in intentions to turnover among employees at the Nakuru County Government, Kenya.

Tenure as an academic: Job tenure which is a measure of number of years worked has a significant effect on intentions to turnover (Nadiri and Tanova, 2010). Previous studies have found that tenure was one of the major determinants of turnover intention whereby employees who have worked for many years have generally lower turnover intention (Karatepe et al., 2006; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). It is expected in this study that academic staff with high tenure are less likely to desire to quit their jobs as compared to those with shorter tenure.

Education: Studies have found that level of education was positively related to turnover intentions (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Kipkebut, 2013; Murupus & Kipkebut, 2015; Choong, Keh, Tan & Tan, 2013). Employees with higher levels of education were more likely to turnover than employees with low levels of education.

Job position: Job position has a significant effect on intentions to turnover. Studies have shown that workers who perform unchallenging work are less likely to leave than employees with high employment status (Kipkebut, 2013; Cohen, 1992; Chiu, Chung, Wu & Ho, 2009). It is therefore expected that higher-ranking academic staff are more likely to have higher turnover intentions than lower-ranking academic staff.

Talent management practices

Transley (2011) defines a talent as a capability that a person has above other people and thus uses it with ease. Talent management is the organized attraction, identification, development, retention and deployment of those persons who are of importance to an organization either because they are fulfilling critical roles in business operations or in view of their “high potential” for the future. Talent management practices comprise a diversity of roles such as training, mentoring, coaching, career management and succession planning (Brandt & Kull, 2007). Studies have shown that employees who are talented and with high potential to an organization are more beneficial, are satisfied with their jobs and have a lower intention to quit (Hornung *et al.*, 2010). A study by Oehley (2007) found that talent management competencies of attracting and recruiting talent have a significant negative effect on employees’ intention to quit the organisation. Du Plessis (2015) found a significant negative relationship between employees’ perception of the organisation’s talent management practices and their intention to quit the organisation. This suggests that satisfactory talent management practices result in low levels of employee intention to quit the organisation (Du Plessis, 2015). Bradley (2016) in his study on talent management in Australian universities found a positive significant relationship between talent management practices and performance. Thiriku & Were (2016) in a study on the effect of talent management strategies on employee retention among employees in private firms in Kenya found a significant positive relationship between talent management practices and employee retention.

Research Hypotheses

From the above reviewed literature, the following research hypotheses are proposed:

- H₀₁: There are no differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on employee demographic characteristics, namely: age, gender, university and job tenure, education and job position.
- H₀₂: Training does not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.
- H₀₃: Succession planning does not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.
- H₀₄: Career management does not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.
- H₀₅: Mentoring does not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.

H₀₆: Coaching does not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.

H₀₇: The combined effect of employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices do not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.

Methodology

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design. Using Nassiuma's (2000) formula a sample of 13 universities from a total of 63 universities in Kenya was derived. The population of the study was 13,441 academic staff from the 63 universities in Kenya. A formula by Yamane (1967) was used to derive a sample size of 388 academic staff. Stratified random sampling was used to determine the sample size per university and thereafter simple random sampling was used to select the respondents from each of the selected universities. Questionnaires were distributed through 'drop and pick' method. A total of 302 questionnaires were filled giving a response rate of 77.8% which is excellent. Mugenda & Mugenda (2012) reported that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good while a response rate of 70% and above is excellent. The descriptive statistics of the respondents' demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of demographic characteristics of the respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	194	64.2
Female	108	35.8
Total	302	100
Age		
Below 30 years	13	4.3
30 - 39 years	91	30.1
40 – 49 years	122	40.4
50 - 59 years	54	17.9
60 years and above	22	7.3
Total	302	100
Level of Education		
Bachelors Degree	12	4.0
Masters Degree	134	44.4
Doctorate Degree	156	51.7
Total	302	100
Tenure as an academic		
5 years and below	49	16.2
6-10 years	108	35.8
11-15 years	67	22.2
16 years and above	78	25.8
Total	302	100
Tenure in the present university		
Below 10 years	181	59.9
10 - 19 years	74	24.5
20 years and above	47	15.6
Total	302	100
Position		
Assistant Lecturer	88	29.1
Lecturer	123	40.7
Senior Lecturer	55	18.2
Professor	36	11.9
Total	302	100

Measurement of variables

Following extensive review of the literature, the questionnaire to collect data for the study was developed and measured on a 5-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, where 1 indicates Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Uncertain, 4-Agree and 5-Strongly Agree. The reliability of the study instrument was

tested using Cronbach Alpha test and the results showed acceptable reliability coefficients as follows: Training ($\alpha=0.883$), Succession Planning ($\alpha = 0.819$), Career Management ($\alpha=0.853$), Mentoring ($\alpha=0.868$), Coaching ($\alpha=0.880$) and academic staff retention ($\alpha =0.629$). The employee demographic characteristics are as follows: age, gender, tenure as an academic, tenure in the current university, education and job position.

Results

The testing of the study hypotheses was subjected to statistical analysis as shown below. Independent samples t-test and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test Hypothesis One, Pearson Correlation analysis was carried out to test Hypothesis Two to Six while multiple regression analysis was conducted to test Hypothesis Seven.

Results of Independent samples t-tests and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

H_{01} : There are no differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on employee demographic characteristics, namely: age, gender, university and job tenure, education and job position.

Gender

Table 2: Results of Independent Samples t-test exploring differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on gender

Gender of respondents		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sign
Training	Male	193	40.10	8.04	.741	.460
	Female	108	39.37	8.43		
Succession Planning	Male	192	37.85	8.98	-.732	.464
	Female	108	38.74	11.89		
Career Management	Male	194	38.54	9.89	1.310	.191
	Female	107	36.97	10.05		
Mentoring	Male	194	27.40	8.24	.083	.934
	Female	108	27.31	8.34		
Coaching	Male	194	22.23	6.41	.268	.789
	Female	107	22.02	6.92		
Academic Staff Retention	Male	194	25.68	5.49	-.184	.854
	Female	107	25.80	5.66		

The results in Table 2 show that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices and academic staff retention among male and female respondents ($p > 0.05$). This suggests that gender of academic staff did not influence satisfaction with talent management practices and decision to remain in the university.

Age**Table 3: Results of One-Way ANOVA exploring differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on age**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Training	Below 30 years	13	42.31	8.96	.411	.801
	30-39 years	91	39.37	8.23		
	40-49 years	121	39.75	7.92		
	50-59 years	54	40.28	8.95		
	60 years and above	22	39.68	7.25		
Succession Planning	Below 30 years	13	40.38	9.05	.374	.827
	30-39 years	90	37.94	10.77		
	40-49 years	121	37.61	8.78		
	50-59 years	54	39.06	11.61		
	60 years and above	22	38.68	11.42		
Career Management	Below 30 years	13	39.38	8.19	.398	.810
	30-39 years	90	38.08	11.34		
	40-49 years	122	37.34	9.01		
	50-59 years	54	39.17	10.22		
	60 years and above	22	37.45	9.77		
Mentoring	Below 30 years	13	27.85	5.41	1.681	.154
	30-39 years	91	28.08	8.42		
	40-49 years	122	25.95	7.80		
	50-59 years	54	28.35	8.08		
	60 years and above	22	29.59	10.96		
Coaching	Below 30 years	13	26.00	3.89	1.336	.257
	30-39 years	91	22.08	6.84		
	40-49 years	122	21.64	6.63		
	50-59 years	53	22.40	6.65		
	60 years and above	22	22.50	6.05		
Academic Staff Retention	Below 30 years	12	30.17	4.04	3.783	.005
	30-39 years	91	26.49	5.01		
	40-49 years	122	25.60	5.60		
	50-59 years	54	24.41	6.06		
	60 years and above	22	24.05	5.27		

The results in Table 3 show that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices namely, training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching among academic staff in different age groups ($p > 0.05$). This means that age did not influence satisfaction or dissatisfaction with talent management practices. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of academic staff retention based on different age groups of respondents ($F = 3.783$, $p = 0.005$). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD analysis showed that respondents aged below 30 years had significantly higher mean scores ($M = 30.17$) than respondents aged 40 – 49 years (25.60), 50 – 59 years ($M = 24.41$) and 60 years and above ($M = 24.05$). This suggests that respondents aged below 30 years were more likely to continue working in their universities unlike respondents aged 40 years and above.

Tenure as an academic**Table 4: Results of One-Way ANOVA exploring differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on tenure as an academic**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Training	Below 5 Years	49	39.43	7.19	.959	.413
	6- 10 years	107	39.07	8.08		
	11 - 15 years	67	41.16	9.25		
	16 years and above	78	40.01	7.89		
Succession Planning	Below 5 Years	49	36.37	8.06	.767	.513
	6 10 years	107	38.07	10.28		
	11 - 15 years	66	38.59	10.26		
	16 years and above	78	39.08	10.93		
Career Management	Below 5 Years	48	37.52	9.63	.287	.835
	6 10 years	108	37.48	10.28		
	11 - 15 years	67	38.25	10.58		
	16 years and above	78	38.73	9.27		
Mentoring	Below 5 Years	49	26.31	8.82	.614	.606
	6 10 years	108	27.37	8.18		
	11 - 15 years	67	27.07	7.28		
	16 years and above	78	28.28	8.84		
Coaching	Below 5 Years	49	22.12	6.45	.171	.916
	6 10 years	108	21.84	6.29		
	11 - 15 years	66	22.56	7.42		
	16 years and above	78	22.27	6.43		
Academic Staff Retention	Below 5 Years	48	26.15	6.40	2.833	.039
	6 - 10 years	108	26.28	5.13		
	11 - 15 years	67	26.34	5.56		
	16 years and above	78	24.17	5.32		

The results of one-way ANOVA in Table 4 shows that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices namely, training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching among academic staff based on tenure as an academic ($p > 0.05$). This means that years worked as an academic did not influence satisfaction or dissatisfaction with talent management practices. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of academic staff retention based on tenure as an academic ($F = 2.833$, $p = 0.039$). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD showed that respondents who had worked as academics for below 5 years ($M = 26.15$), 6 – 10 years ($M = 26.28$) and 11 – 15 years ($M = 26.34$) had significantly higher mean scores than respondents who had worked as academics for 16 years and above ($M = 24.17$). This suggests that respondents who had worked as academics for 16 years and above were more likely to quit their jobs unlike respondents who had worked as academics for 15 years and below.

Tenure in the university**Table 5: Results of One-Way ANOVA exploring differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on tenure in the university**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Training	Below 10 years	180	39.87	8.12	.223	.800
	10-19 years	74	39.39	8.78		
	20 years and above	47	40.40	7.49		
Succession Planning	Below 10 years	179	38.72	10.52	.646	.525
	10-19 years	74	37.42	8.90		
	20 years and above	47	37.28	10.41		
Career Management	Below 10 years	180	38.70	10.11	1.194	.304
	10-19 years	74	36.73	9.99		
	20 years and above	47	37.21	9.26		
Mentoring	Below 10 years	181	27.10	8.17	.347	.707
	10-19 years	74	27.49	9.27		
	20 years and above	47	28.21	6.95		
Coaching	Below 10 years	180	22.51	6.59	.746	.475
	10-19 years	74	21.41	6.97		
	20 years and above	47	22.00	5.98		
Academic Staff Retention	Below 10 years	180	26.37	5.32	5.194	.006
	10-19 years	74	25.58	5.61		
	20 years and above	47	23.49	5.81		

The results of one-way ANOVA in Table 5 shows that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices namely, training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching among academic staff based on tenure in the university ($p > 0.05$). This means that years worked in the university did not influence satisfaction or dissatisfaction with talent management practices. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of academic staff retention based on tenure in the university ($F = 5.194$, $p = 0.006$). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD showed that respondents who had worked in the university for 20 years and above had significantly lower mean scores ($M = 23.49$) than respondents who had worked in the university for below 10 years ($M = 26.37$). This suggests that respondents who had worked in the universities for less than 10 years were more likely to continue working in their universities unlike respondents who had worked for 20 years and above. This means that academics who had worked for 20 years and above were among the oldest and experienced in the academic ranks and thus likely to take early retirement or other assignments outside academia.

Level of education**Table 6: Results of One-Way ANOVA exploring differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on level of education**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Training	Bachelor's Degree	12	36.83	8.18	1.045	.353
	Masters Degree	133	39.63	8.07		
	Doctorate Degree	156	40.24	8.26		
Succession Planning	Bachelor's Degree	12	34.92	8.92	1.017	.363
	Masters Degree	133	37.75	8.66		
	Doctorate Degree	155	38.78	11.28		
Career Management	Bachelor's Degree	12	34.58	10.45	1.039	.355
	Masters Degree	133	37.62	9.96		
	Doctorate Degree	156	38.55	9.93		
Mentoring	Bachelor's Degree	12	21.83	8.99	2.840	.050
	Masters Degree	134	27.63	8.93		
	Doctorate Degree	156	27.57	7.48		
Coaching	Bachelor's Degree	12	20.08	6.99	.820	.441
	Masters Degree	134	22.51	6.72		
	Doctorate Degree	155	22.01	6.45		
Academic Staff Retention	Bachelor's Degree	12	27.50	4.78	1.475	.231
	Masters Degree	133	26.11	5.37		
	Doctorate Degree	156	25.26	5.72		

The results of one-way ANOVA in Table 6 shows that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices (training, succession planning, career management, coaching) and retention among academic staff based on level of education ($p > 0.05$). This means that level of education did not influence satisfaction with talent management practices and retention. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of mentoring based on level of education ($F = 2.840$, $p = 0.052$). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD showed that respondents with Masters Degree ($M = 26.11$) and Doctorate degree ($M = 27.57$) had significantly higher mean scores of mentoring than respondents with Bachelors Degree ($M = 21.83$). This suggests that respondents with Bachelors degree, mainly Graduate Assistants were dissatisfied with the mentoring programmes in their universities.

Job Position**Table 7: Results of One-Way ANOVA exploring differences in talent management practices and academic staff retention based on job position**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Training	Assistant Lecturer	87	38.25	8.29	1.710	.165
	Lecturer	123	40.69	8.44		
	Senior Lecturer	55	40.58	7.97		
	Professor	36	39.61	6.94		
Succession Planning	Assistant Lecturer	88	37.17	8.45	1.278	.282
	Lecturer	123	39.54	10.71		
	Senior Lecturer	53	37.38	9.76		
	Professor	36	37.11	12.00		
Career Management	Assistant Lecturer	88	36.42	9.34	1.290	.278
	Lecturer	122	39.16	10.94		
	Senior Lecturer	55	37.91	9.76		
	Professor	36	37.94	7.88		
Mentoring	Assistant Lecturer	88	26.34	8.55	1.916	.127
	Lecturer	123	28.72	8.72		
	Senior Lecturer	55	26.33	7.31		
	Professor	36	26.83	6.79		
Coaching	Assistant Lecturer	88	21.34	6.32	1.256	.290
	Lecturer	122	23.01	7.02		
	Senior Lecturer	55	21.62	6.39		
	Professor	36	22.08	5.90		
Academic Staff Retention	Assistant Lecturer	87	26.32	5.50	2.628	.050
	Lecturer	123	26.28	5.28		
	Senior Lecturer	55	24.64	5.98		
	Professor	36	24.03	5.48		

The results of one-way ANOVA in Table 7 shows that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices namely, training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching among academic staff in different academic positions ($p > 0.05$). This means that job position did not influence satisfaction or dissatisfaction with talent management practices. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of retention based on different job positions ($F = 2.628$, $p = 0.050$). Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD showed that Assistant Lecturers ($M = 26.32$) and Lecturers ($M = 26.28$) had significantly higher mean scores than Senior Lecturers ($M = 24.64$) and Professors ($M = 24.03$). This suggests that Assistant Lecturers and Lecturers were more likely to stay in their universities than Senior Lecturers and Professors.

Results of Pearson Correlation analysis

Hypotheses Two to Six sought to determine the effect of talent management practices on academic staff retention. These hypotheses were tested using Pearson's Correlation analysis which determines the strength and direction of the relationships among the study variables.

Table 8: Pearson's Correlation Analysis exploring the relationship between combined talent management practices and staff retention

	Training	Succession Planning	Career Management	Mentoring	Coaching	Academic Staff Retention
Training	1	.609**	.683**	.508**	.464**	.275**
Succession Planning	.609**	1	.658**	.567**	.543**	.263**
Career Management	.683**	.658**	1	.541**	.562**	.327**
Mentoring	.508**	.567**	.541**	1	.688**	.248**
Coaching	.464**	.543**	.562**	.688**	1	.311**
Academic Staff Retention	.275**	.263**	.327**	.248**	.311**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed).

H₀₂: Training does not have a significant effect on academic staff retention.

The results in Table 8 shows that there is a weak, significant positive relationship between training and academic staff retention ($r = 0.275$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that retention was high among academics who were satisfied with training in their universities or vice versa.

H₀₃: Succession planning does not have a significant effect on academic staff retention

The results in Table 8 shows that there is a weak, significant positive relationship between succession planning and academic staff retention ($r = 0.263$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that retention was high among academics who were satisfied with the succession planning programmes in their universities or vice versa.

H₀₄: Career management does not have a significant effect on academic staff retention

The results in Table 8 shows that career management had a weak significant relationship with academic staff retention ($r = 0.327$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that academics who were satisfied with the career management programmes in their universities were more likely to stay in their universities while those who were dissatisfied with career management programmes were more likely to quit.

H₀₅: Mentoring does not have a significant effect on academic staff retention

The results in Table 8 showed that mentoring had significant, positive correlations with academic staff retention ($r = 0.248$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that mentoring positively influenced academics desire to remain in their universities. On the other hand, dissatisfaction with mentoring programmes was likely to influence intentions to turnover.

H₀₆: Coaching does not have a significant effect on academic staff retention

The results in Table 8 showed that there was a significant positive correlation between coaching and academic staff retention ($r = 0.311$, $p = 0.000$). This suggests that coaching positively enhanced academic staff retention. On the other hand, dissatisfaction with coaching was likely to influence intentions to turnover.

Results of Multiple regression analysis

H₀₇: The joint effect of employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices do not have significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya.

Hypothesis Seven was tested using multiple regression analysis. Multiple regression analysis was carried out to determine the joint effect of employee demographic characteristics (namely, gender, age, tenure as an academic, tenure in the university, level of education and job position) and talent management practices (namely, training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching) on academic staff retention.

Table 9: Results of multiple regression analysis establishing the joint effects of employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices on academic staff retention

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.422 ^a	.178	.146	5.13939

a. Predictors: (Constant), Coaching, Level of Education, Gender of respondents, Years worked in the university, Training, Position held, Age of the respondents, Succession Planning, Mentoring, Career Management, Years worked as an Academic

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1626.112	11	147.828	5.597	.000b
	Residual	7501.388	284	26.413		
	Total	9127.500	295			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Retention

b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaching, Level of Education, Gender of respondents, Years worked in the university, Training, Position held, Age of the respondents, Succession Planning, Mentoring, Career Management, Years worked as an Academic

Coefficients ^a								
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	20.006	2.266		8.828	.000		
	Gender	.348	.640	.030	.544	.587	.952	1.051
	Age	-.700	.435	-.122	-1.607	.109	.503	1.988
	Tenure as an Academic	-.110	.343	-.030	-.320	.749	.332	3.009
	Tenure in the university	-.116	.450	-.021	-.258	.797	.449	2.226
	Level of Education	-.118	.639	-.012	-.185	.853	.662	1.511
	Position held	-.393	.366	-.078	-1.074	.284	.552	1.811
	Training	.041	.054	.060	.763	.446	.466	2.146
	Succession Planning	.007	.044	.012	.148	.883	.441	2.265
	Career Management	.099	.047	.178	2.099	.037	.403	2.481
	Mentoring	.005	.054	.007	.090	.928	.446	2.241
	Coaching	.144	.067	.171	2.152	.032	.460	2.172

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Retention

The model summary of the regression analysis in Table 9 shows that employee demographic characteristics (namely, gender, age, tenure as an academic, tenure in the university, level of education and job position) and talent management practices (namely, training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching) explained 17.8 % of the variance in academic staff retention ($R^2 = .178$). Therefore, 82.2 % of the variance in academic staff retention was explained by other factors not in the study. Further, the F -test statistic ($F = 5.597$, $p = 0.000$) shows the fitness of the regression model, which means that employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices are significant predictors of academic staff retention. Thus, the null hypothesis which state that the joint effect of employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices do not have a significant effect on retention among academic staff in Universities in Kenya is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted.

The standardised beta coefficients show that Career Management ($\beta = 0.178$, $p = 0.037$) and Coaching ($\beta = 0.171$, $p = 0.032$) were significant positive predictors of academic staff retention. This implies that academic staff retention increased when universities had effective career management and coaching programmes for the academic staff. On the other hand, the standardised beta coefficients show that gender, age, tenure as an academic, tenure in the university, level of education, job position, Training, Succession Planning and Mentoring did not have any significant effect on academic staff retention ($p > 0.05$). This implies that demographic characteristics, training, succession planning and mentoring did not influence academic staff retention.

Discussions

The main objective of the study was to determine the effect of employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya. Studies have found that demographic characteristics are important in determining employee retention (Agyeman & Ponniah, 2014; Choong *et al.*, 2013; Segbenya, 2014).

Gender: The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices and academic staff retention among male and female academics. This is consistent with study by Obwoyere & Kipkebut (2016) which found that there were no gender differences in intentions to turnover among employees at the Nakuru County Government, Kenya. Contrary to these findings, Choong *et al.* (2013) found that turnover rates were higher among female academic staff as compared to male academic staff in private universities in Malaysia. Segbenya (2014) found that intention to quit was high among female employees as compared to the male employees in Commercial banks in Ghana.

Age: The results show that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices based on the age of academic staff. This means that age did not influence satisfaction with the talent management practices. On the other hand, the analysis found that retention was higher among academics aged below 30 years than academics aged 40 years and above. This is contrary to studies that have found that older employees were less likely to turnover as compared to younger workers (Kipkebut, 2013; Segbenya, 2014; Murupus & Kipkebut, 2015; Choong *et al.*, 2013).

Tenure as an academic: The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices among academic staff based on tenure as an academic. This means that years worked as an academic did not influence satisfaction with talent management practices. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of academic staff retention based on tenure as an academic. Specifically, respondents who had worked as academics for 16 years and above were more likely to quit their jobs unlike respondents who had worked as academics for 15 years and below. Academics with 16 years and above experience in academia are likely to take early retirement or are eligible for assignments outside academia or top management positions in universities. This finding is contrary to results of previous studies that found that employees with long tenure have lower turnover intention than employees who have shorter tenure (Emiroglua *et al.*, 2015; Martin and Roodt, 2008). On the other hand, Hayes (2015) did not find a statistically significant difference between length of stay and intention to quit.

Tenure in the university: The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of talent management practices among academic staff based on tenure in the university. On the other hand, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of academic staff retention based on tenure in the university. The results show that respondents who had worked in the universities for less than 10 years were more likely to continue working in their universities unlike respondents who had worked for 20 years and above. This is contrary to the findings of previous research which found that the employees with high tenure had lower turnover intentions (Choong *et al.*, 2015; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). Employees who had worked for long were willing to remain in their respective institutions as compared to those who had worked for few years (Agyeman & Ponnaiah, 2014; Segbenya, 2014).

Level of Education: The results showed that the mean scores of training, succession planning, career development and coaching did not differ significantly among academic staff based on their level of education. The study found that mean scores of mentoring differed significantly based on the level of education with academics with Bachelors degree holders being more dissatisfied with the universities mentoring programmes than Masters and PhD holders. Bachelor degree holders are likely to be Graduate Assistants who would benefit highly from well-structured mentoring programmes in order to grow in their careers. The results further showed that there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of academic staff retention based on level of education. This shows that the level of education does not influence retention. Contrary to this finding Akovaa, Cetin & Cifci (2015) found a significant relationship between employee's level of education and turnover intentions where employees with higher qualifications had higher job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions. On the other hand, Hayes (2015) did not find a statistically significant relationship between education and intention to quit.

Job Position: The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of training, succession planning, career management, mentoring and coaching among academic staff in different job positions. On the other hand, the analysis showed that Assistant Lecturers and Lecturers were more likely to stay in their universities as they have not accumulated adequate human capital unlike Senior Lecturers and Professors who were more likely to quit as they were eligible for attractive opportunities outside their universities. This is contrary to previous studies which found that employees who had higher position such as managers and assistant managers had lower turnover intention than employees who held lower positions (Arnoux-Nicolas, 2016; Agyeman & Ponniah, 2014). Similarly, Khan *et al.* (2013) reported that academicians in higher designations (Associate Professors and Professors) are more likely to stay in their universities since they have higher salaries, better furnished offices, better health facilities, higher responsibilities and other fringe benefits unlike academics in lower positions.

Training: The results showed that there is a weak, significant positive relationship between training and academic staff retention. This is consistent with previous research which found a significant positive relationship between training and academic staff retention (Onah & Anikwe, 2016; Ng'ethe, 2013; Ayodo, 2014). Similarly, Hassan, Razi, Qamar, Jaffir & Suhail (2013) in a study of employees in Telecommunication sector in Pakistan found that training strongly enhanced employee retention.

Succession planning: The results showed that there is a weak, significant positive relationship between succession planning and academic staff retention. The findings are consistent with previous studies which found that succession planning enhanced employee retention (Adewale, Abolaji & Kolade, 2011; Eshiteti, 2013; Salaman, 2014; Milkovich & Boundreau, 2008).

Career management: The results showed that career management has a weak significant positive correlation with academic staff retention. Further, results of regression analysis showed that career management was a significant positive predictor of retention. The findings are consistent with previous studies which found statistically significant positive relationship between career management and retention (Allen, Lynn & Rodger, 2003; Korantwi-Barimah, 2017; Selesho & Naile, 2014). According to Huselid (2012) employees who are unhappy with their career prospects are most likely to leave their organization.

Mentoring: The results showed that mentoring had significant, positive correlations with academic staff retention. The findings are consistent with previous studies which found statistically significant positive relationship between mentoring and retention (Mundia, 2014; Kamau, 2017). Omale, Oguche, Duru & Daniel (2017) found that mentoring enhanced retention among employees in four (4) private universities in Nigeria resulting in reduction of recruitment and training costs and loss of talent associated with managerial knowledge. Further, ANOVA results showed that academics with Bachelor's degrees (most likely Graduate Assistants) were most dissatisfied with mentoring programmes in their universities. Consistent with this finding, Allen (2004) in a meta-analysis study comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals established that mentored individuals reported greater career satisfaction, career commitment and expectations for advancement resulting in enhanced retention.

Coaching: The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between coaching and academic staff retention. Further, the results of regression analysis showed that coaching was a significant positive predictor of retention. The results are consistent with the findings of Chitsaz and Boustani (2014) which revealed that there was a positive and significant relationship between Coaching and employee retention among employees of Isfahan University. Similarly, Muriithi (2016) in a study on the effect of coaching on employee performance in Standard Chartered Bank, Kenya reported that frequent provision of feedback and structured coaching plan positively influenced employee performance resulting in enhanced employee morale and motivation thus improving employees' productivity.

Conclusions

The main objective of this study was to establish the effect of employee demographic characteristics and talent management practices on retention among academic staff in Kenyan universities. The analyses showed that there were no significant differences in the mean scores of Training, Succession Planning, Career Management, Mentoring and Coaching on the basis of gender, age, tenure and position held. In addition, the analysis showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores of mentoring on the basis of level of education.

Further, the analysis showed that retention was affected by age, tenure as an academic, tenure in the university and job position of academic staff. The results of correlation analysis showed that talent management practices had significant positive relationships with academic staff retention. Finally, the results of the multiple regression analysis showed that career development and coaching were significant positive predictors of retention.

Recommendations

The findings of this study have several recommendations for university top managers in order to improve academic staff retention in their universities. The significant effect of demographic characteristics on retention showed that the success of the universities in achieving their objectives was dependent on ensuring that academic staff are satisfied and committed thus enhancing retention and productivity. Specifically, top university policy makers should implement various retention strategies targeting academics in the positions of Senior Lecturer and Professors, older academic (40 years and above) and those with longer tenure in academics (16 years and above) and in their universities (20 years and above). These can include creating a pleasant and supportive work environment, recognition, rewards and provision of adequate training and promotion.

Universities should enact policies that promote talent management which will in turn promote sustainable academic staff retention and competitive advantage. Top management need to encourage academic staff to work as a team and give as much responsibility to each team member as possible. In the teams, newly recruited academic staff should be assigned to more experienced academic staffs who have worked for long for mentorship. The academic staff should also be provided with career development opportunities to advance in the universities through internal promotions. Training and development opportunities should be provided so that academic staff can qualify for higher positions within their universities. Succession Planning is important for universities so that they can identify qualified persons to fill vacant positions. Through succession planning programmes, top management should be proactive and have a pool of people that can fill current and future vacant leadership roles. Each university needs to develop its own unique career development programs that will improve academic staff retention which can result to increased productivity and reduced turnover intentions. Academic staff needs knowledge of their strengths and consequently the areas where they can improve to be able to develop in the best possible manner. Feedback should be given to the academic staff to clarify areas which they need to improve. Coaching builds on this knowledge and contributes instructions, guidance and support to allow employees to act on the feedback that they are given.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study should be considered with a few limitations in mind. The research sought to collect information from academic staff from private and public universities regarding sensitive issues on talent management practices being implemented in their universities. The study anticipated the possibility that the academic staff may not feel free to provide the information sought. The study addressed this challenge by acquiring necessary research permits from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation and authorization letters from each of the concerned Universities. The researcher also assured the study participants that confidentiality and other dimensions of research ethics would be observed. The study further encountered difficulties in questionnaire administration as it targeted all cadres of academic staff. The academic staff works on strict schedules and getting time with them to fill the questionnaires was quite difficult. The study addressed this problem by using the 'drop and pick' method of questionnaire administration. Lastly, the study used cross-sectional research design which means that data was collected at one point in time. This means that the study was unable to establish the long-term effects of demographic characteristics and talent management practices on retention among academic staff in Kenyan universities. Thus, future studies may carry out a similar research using longitudinal research design.

References

- Agyeman, C., & Ponniah, V. (2014) Employee Demographic Characteristics and Their Effects on Turnover and Retention in MSMEs. *International Journal of Recent Advances Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences* 1 (1), 12-29.
- Adewale, O., Abolaji, A. J., & Kolade, O. J., (2011). Succession planning and organizational survival: Empirical study on Nigerian private tertiary institutions. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 6 (2), 231-246.

- Achoui, M., & Mansour, M. (2007). Employee Turnover and Retention Strategies: Evidence from Saudi Companies. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(3), 1-16.
- Ahuja, M., K., Chudoba, K., M., Kacmar, C., J., McKnight, D., H., and George, J. F. (2007). IT Road Warrior: Balancing Work-Family Conflict, Job Autonomy and Work Overload to Mitigate Turnover Intentions. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 1-17.
- Allen, G., Lynn, M., & Rodger W. (2003) The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management* 29(1), 99-118.
- Arnoux-Nicolas, C., Sovet, L., Lhotellier, L., Di Fabio, A., & Bernaud, J. L. (2016). Perceived work conditions and turnover intentions: The mediating role of meaning of work. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, 704.
- Akova, O., Cetin, G., & Cifci, I. (2015). The relation between demographic factors and the turnover intention in pre-opening hotel businesses. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 377-384.
- Amaral, A., Orlanda T., Sónia C., & Cristina S., (2016) Shifting institutional boundaries through cross-border higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 20 (1) 48-60.
- Armstrong, M. A. (2007). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Ayodo, I. A., Namusonge, G. S., Ayodo, K. & Maluti, V. (2014). Influence of Training on Employee Retention in Public Universities In Kenya: Case Of The Masinde Muliro University Of Science And Technology-Kenya. *International Journal for Management Science and Technology*, 2 (4), 243-256.
- Barkhuizen, N., Mogwere, P., & Schutte, N. (2014). Talent management, work engagement and service quality orientation of support staff in a higher education institution, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (4), 69-78.
- Beechler, S., & Woodward, I. C. (2009). The global “war for talent”. *Journal of International Management*, 15(3), 273-285.
- Bernard, B. (2012). Factors that determine academic staff retention and commitment in private tertiary institutions in Botswana: Empirical review. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 1(9), 278-299.
- Bradley, A.P. (2016). Talent management for universities. *Australian Universities' Review*, 58(1), 13-19.
- Brandt, E. & Kull P (2007). *Talent Management: How firms in Sweden find and nurture value adding human resources*. Sweden. Internationella Handelshogskolan.
- Chitsaz-Isfahani, A., & Boustani, H. R. (2014). Effects of talent management on employees’ retention: The mediate effect of organizational trust. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(5), pp.114-128
- Cobb, J., & Dee, R. (2015). Greener Pastures: Faculty Turnover Intent in Urban Public Universities. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(3), pp.275-286.
- Chiu, Y.L., Chung, R.G., Wu, C.S., & Ho, C.H. (2009). The effects of job demand, control and social support on hospital clinical nurses’ intention to turnover. *Applied Nursing Research*, 22 (4), pp. 258–263.
- Choong, Y., Keh, C., Tan, & Tan, C (2013) Impacts of Demographic Antecedents toward Turnover Intention amongst Academic Staff in Malaysian Private Universities. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 7(6): 46-54
- Coetzee, M. (2015). Identity theory and research in the South African organisational context: book review. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 41(1), 1-2.
- Cohen, A., 1992. Antecedents of organizational commitment across occupational groups: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 13, pp. 539-558.

- Du Plessis, L., Barkhuizen, N., Stanz, K., & Schutte, N. (2015). The management side of talent: Causal implications for the retention of generation Y employees. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 31(5), 1767.
- Emiroğlu, B. D., Akovab, O., & Tanriverdi, H. (2015). The Relationship Between Turnover Intention and Demographic Factors in hotel businesses: A Study at Five Star Hotels in Istanbul. *Procedia - Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences* (207) 385-397.
- Eshiteti, S. N., Okaka, O., Maragia, S. N., Odera, O., & Akerele, E. K. (2013). Effects of succession planning programs on staff retention. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (6), 157-168.
- Griffeth, R., Hom, P., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 463-488.
- Gupta, Y., Kumar, A. & Seemarani (2015) A Study of Employee Retention V/S Demographic Variables in IT-Units of Pune City *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, 5 (1), pp. 96-103
- Hassan, W., Razi, A., Qamar, R., Jaffir, R. & Suhail, S. (2013) The Effect of Training on Employee Retention. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research Administration and Management*, 13 (6), pp. 17-20
- Hayes, T. M. (2015). *Demographic characteristics predicting employee turnover intentions*. PhD dissertation, Walden University.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, M., & Weigl, M. (2010). Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 187-215.
- Huselid, J. (2012) *A strategic Approach to Human Resource Management*: Prentice Hall, London.
- Irshad, M., & Afridi, F. (2012). Factors Affecting Employee Retention: Evidence from Literature. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*. 4 (2), 307-339.
- Jadoo, S.A.A., Aljunid, S.M., Dastan, L., Tawfeeq, R.S., Mustafa, M.A., Ganasegeran, K. & AlDubai, S.A.R., (2015) Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention among Iraqi doctors: A descriptive cross-sectional multicenter study, *Human Resources for Health*, 13(21), pp.1-11.
- Kamau & Kamara (2017) Influence of Career Development Practices On Employee Retention In Public Universities In Kenya. *Journal of business and change management* 4 (2) 510-522
- Karatepe, O. M., & Karadas, G. (2012). The effect of management commitment to service quality on job embeddedness and performance outcomes. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 13(4), 614-636.
- Khan, I., Nawaz, A., Khan, F., Khan, H. & Yar, N. B. (2013) Determining the Impact of Demographics on the Intention to Leave of Academicians in HEIs of DCs Like Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 13 (7), pp. 41-44
- Kheirkhah, M., Akbarpouran, V., & Haqani, H. (2016). Relationship between Talent Management and Organization Learning among Midwives Operating in Iran University of Medical Sciences. *Research Journal of Medical Sciences*, 10 (5), 536-540.
- Kibui, A. W., H. Gachunga, G. S. & Namusonge, G. S. (2014) Role of Talent Management on employees retention in Kenya: A survey of state corporations in Kenya: Empirical review. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 3 (2), 414-424.
- King, A. W., Fowler, S. W., & Zeithaml, C. P. (2001). Managing organizational competencies for competitive advantage: The middle-management edge. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 15 (2), 95-106.
- Kipkebut, D. J. (2010). Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in Higher Educational Institutions: The Kenyan Case, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Middlesex University, UK.

- Kipkebut, D. J. (2013). The Effects of Demographic Characteristics on Organisational Commitment, job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: The Case of Employees in Kenyan Universities, *Journal of Organization and Human Behaviour*, 2 (1), 20 – 33.
- Kissoonduth, K. (2017). *Talent Management: Attracting and retaining academic staff at selected public higher education institutions* (Doctoral dissertation-University of South Africa).
- Korantwi-Barimah, S. (2017) Factors Influencing the Retention of Academic Staff in a Ghanaian Technical University, *Human Resource Management Research*. 7 (3), 111-119.
- Le Roux, C. H., & Rothmann, S. (2013). Contractual relations between employers and employees in an HEI: individual and organisational outcomes. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 27(4), 900-919.
- Losem, G. C. (2015). *Performance of Part-Time Teaching Staff and its Effects On University Performance, A Case of Universities in Nakuru Town* (Doctoral Dissertation, Kabarak University).
- Martin, A., & Roodt, G. (2008). Perceptions of organisational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a post-merger South African tertiary institution. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(1), 23-31.
- Marchington, M., & Wilkson, A., (2006). *Human Resource Management at Work: People Management and Development*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- May, R. L. (2013). *An Investigation of the Casualization of Academic Work in Australia* (Doctoral dissertation, Griffith University).
- Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: pp. 171-194
- Milkovich, T. & Boudreau, J. (1988) *Personnel /Human Resource Management: A Diagnostic Approach* 5th Edition Homewood Illinois.
- Mugove, L.A & Mukanzi, O. Determinants of employee turnover in the selected Kenyan public universities. *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 5(4), 119-126.
- Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A. G. (2007) *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi, Kenya: ACTS Press.
- Mubarak, R., Wahab, Z., & Khan, N. (2012). Faculty Retention in Higher Education Institutions of Pakistan. *International Journal of Theories and Research in Education*, 7(2), 65-78.
- Murupus, N. M. & Kipkebut, D. J. (2015) Effect of employee demographic characteristics and selected Human Resource Management Practices turnover intentions: A case of commercial banks in Eldoret Town, Kenya, *International Journal of Management & Information Technology*, 10 (10), pp. 2555-2569
- Muimi, M. (2015). *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover Intention at South Eastern Kenya University* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
- Mundia, C. N. (2014). Role of Mentoring Programs on the Employee Performance in Organisations: A Survey of Public Universities in Nyeri County, Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4 (8), 393.
- Muriithi, C. (2016). *Effect of Coaching on Employee Performance in Commercial Banks: A Case of Standard Chartered Bank Kenya Limited* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International journal of hospitality management*, 29(1), 33-41.
- Nestor, P.I. & Leary, P. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non-tenure track status of Extension faculty and job satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, 38 (4).

- Ndung'u, D. K., & Omondi, M. (2015). Relationship between Talent Management Practices and Employee Turnover: A Case Study of the Co-Operative Bank of Kenya. *Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, 2 (2), 64-68.
- Njanjose, I. L. (2016). *An investigation into talent management and employee retention in the higher education sector of South Africa: a case of the Durban University of Technology* (Doctoral dissertation-Durban University of Technology).
- Ngobeni, E. K., & Bezuidenhout, A. (2015). Engaging employees for improved retention at a higher education institution in South Africa. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(23), 61-99.
- Nassiuma D. K. (2000). *Survey sampling: Theory and methods*. Njoro, Kenya: Egerton University Press.
- Ng'ethe, J. M., Iravo, M., & Namusonge, G. S. (2012). Determinants of Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya: Empirical Review. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(3), 205 -212.
- Ngigi, E. W. & Kipkebut, D. J. (2014) Effect of employee demographic characteristics and job characteristics on job satisfaction among employees in the banking industry: A case of commercial banks in Nakuru Town, Kenya, *International Journal of Management & Information Technology*, 9 (3) pp. 1698-1711
- Oehley, A. M. (2007). *The Development and Evaluation of a Partial Talent Management Competency Model* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch).
- Omale, S. A., Oguche, D., Duru, C. E. & Daniel, I. M. (2017) Impact of Mentoring on Staff Retention through Knowledge Transfer: An Empirical Evaluation of Four Private Universities in the North Central Zone of Nigeria, *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5 (2), pp. 14-24,
- Onah, F. O. & Anikwe, O. S. (2016). The Task of Attraction and Retention of Academic Staff in Nigeria Universities. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 7 (2), 9.
- Obwoyere R.A & Kipkebut D.J. (2016). Effect of Employee Demographic Characteristics and Job Satisfaction on Intentions to Turnover: A Case of Employees in Nakuru County Government, Kenya. *The International Journal of Business & Management*. 4 (11)76-86.
- Roser, M. (2017). *Teachers and professors*. Our World in Data.
- Rustiana, A., & Rahmaningtyas, W. (2018). Study of Management Diversity Based on Biographical Characteristics in Higher Education. *KnE Social Sciences*, 1082-1090.
- Salaman, G. T. (2014). Relationship between succession planning practices and employee retention in large media houses in Kenya. *Unpublished dissertation. University of Nairobi: Kenya*.
- Segbenya, M. (2014). The Effects of Demographic Variables on Employees' Decisions to Stay or Quit in Ghana Commercial Bank, Kumasi. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(12), 145-153.
- Selesho, M. J. & Naile, I. (2014). Academic Staff Retention as a Human Resource Factor:University Perspective. *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 1295-304.
- Sojka, L. & Stefko, R., (2014). Position of talent management in context of organizational functions. *European Scientific Journal*. 17(3) 107-124.
- Schuler, R. S., Jackson, S. E., & Tarique, I. (2011). Global talent management and global talent challenges: Strategic opportunities for IHRM. *Journal of World Business*, 46 (4), 506-516.
- Thiriku, M., & Were, S. (2016). Effect of talent management strategies on employee retention among private firms in Kenya: A case of Data Centre Ltd–Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2 (2), 145-157.
- Tansley, C. (2011). What do we Mean by the term “Talent” in Talent Management?. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 43 (5), 266-274.

- Tettey, J. W. (2006). Developing and Retaining the Next Generation of Academics in Africa: An Analysis of Issues and Challenges. *AAU Newsletter*, 15 (1), 1-9.
- Walsh, K. & Taylor, M. S. (2007). Developing In-House Careers and Retaining Management Talent: What Hospitality Professionals Want From Their Jobs. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 48 (2), 163-182.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*. (2nd Ed.) New York: Harper and Row.