

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

## Factors Determining Academic Staff Motivation and Retention: Experience from Selected Universities

Violet Kimbavala

Assistant Lecturer, Department of Business and Economics,  
University of Iringa, Iringa, Tanzania

### Abstract:

*The academic staff of higher education institution is a key resource to institution's success. Colleges and universities are fighting for high-caliber Academic staff in order to improve the quality of teaching and gaining excellent reputation. Many academic staff are specialists in their disciplines, have attained great academic heights and are hard to come by. Because their jobs have national and global relevance, they tend to be very mobile. Academic staff motivation and retention have always been the major challenges being faced by almost every academic university across the globe. Specifically, the study aimed at examining the factors affecting academic staff motivation and retention. The study used cross-sectional research design whereas data were gathered using questionnaires and interviews. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study found that unmet academic staff expectations are leading factors followed by unsteady promotion practices, feedback system, and training and development. MUCE seems to have relatively higher motivation and retention than RUCU and UoI. It is imperative for universities to keep an eye on issues that may bring about academic staff turnover and be vigilant.*

**Keywords:** Academic staff, motivation, retention, universities, UoI, MUCE, RUCU

### 1. Introduction

The academic staff of higher education institution is a key resource to institution's success. Academic staff, in particular, accounts for a significant component of the budget of higher education institutions and has a major role to play in achieving the objectives of the institution (Bayissa & Zewdie, 2009). Colleges and universities are fighting for high-caliber employees in order to improve the quality of teaching and gaining excellent reputation (Bayissa & Zewdie, 2009). Academic staffs are essential to human capital development. In fact, many academic staff are specialists in their disciplines, have attained great academic heights and are hard to come by. Because their jobs have national and global relevance, they tend to be very mobile (Osakwe, 2014).

The topic of employee motivation and retention is a complicated issue, which is given by the individuality of each person and reflects not only to the specific needs of each person, but sometimes even their very different rating in terms of importance (Němečková, 2017). Well-motivated academic staff can, with appropriate support, build a national and international reputation for themselves and the institution in the research, publishing and professional areas. Such a profile may have a significant impact on the ability of the institution to attract high caliber students, research funds and consultancy contracts (Bayissa & Zewdie, 2009).

On the other hand, Academic institutions are faced with a problem of academic staff retention. Various scholars have defined retention. As per (Ajmal et al., 2016), retention is the organization's capacity to keep its employees to work and continue in the organization for a long period of time. Authors in (Humphreys et al., 2009) suggest that retention does not imply indefinite length of service in one location, employer or organization, but refers to some minimum length of stay. Employee retention is a significant concern and expense for every organization, with the expense of recruiting and retaining a new worker costing anywhere from half to 200% of the departing employee's annual salary (GUMA, 2011). Employees in an organization are said to have a high job retention when all or most of the established post in that organization are filled, when they have low or no intentions to turnover, have had a consistency in job status, have had a career development or when employees do keep their jobs for a considerable long period of time (Maneno, 2018).

Higher education institutions are therefore more dependent on the intellectual and creative abilities and commitment of the academic staff than most other organizations. This therefore makes it critically important to retain this cadre of staff (Maneno, 2018). To effectively retain workers, employers must know what factors motivate their employees to stay in the field and what factors cause them to leave. It is always important to keep skilled employees in any organization in order to improve the kind of service that is provided to the relevant customers (Mrara, 2010).

The study involved three universities namely, University of Iringa (UoI), Ruaha Catholic University (RUCU), and Mkwawa University College (MUCO). The study addressed the following key questions: 1. What are the factors determining academic staff motivation and retention among selected universities, and 2. To what extent does each factor affect academic staff motivation and retention among universities?

The rest of the paper is organized as follows, section 2 covers literature review, section 3 covers methodology of the study, next section 4 details the results and discussion, lastly section 5 concludes the article.

## 2. Literature Review

A research conducted by (Maneno, 2018) examined the role of employees' motivation and retention among academic staff of Private HLLs in Tanzania. Specifically, the study focused on factors that motivate academic staff in Tanzanian Private HLLs. This study also addresses the factors which enhance retention of academic staff in Tanzanian Private HLLs and in the end, it addresses the challenges that face academicians at Private HLLs in Tanzania. This study has found that factors that motivate academic staffs in Tanzanian private HLLs are salary increases, working conditions, interpersonal relations, job security, fringe benefits and leadership, motivational, recognition growth and promotional opportunities, work life balance, training and development and transparency.

A study by (Bernard, 2012) suggest the following factors that determine academic staff retention; the whole employment package (the rewards and benefits of the job) relative to other employment. These include pay and fringe benefits (pension and gratuity, comparative pay levels, pay systems, pay discrimination), intrinsic aspects of the job (e.g., for academics, teaching and research), job security, work organization, autonomy, progression (changes in career paths, internal promotion, promotion criteria, Research Assessment Exercise [RAE]), family-friendly practices, congeniality of colleagues and the working environment.

A study by (Hebenstreit, 2008) reveal that some factors contributing to employee decisions to join, stay with, and leave their places of employment are not valued equally by all employees and that some of these variations in importance can be attributed to individual Enneagram type. The study also found that individuals do not value the same factors equally when having decided to join, remain with, or leave organizations.

In their study, (ROBBINS et al., 2001) stipulate that the non-academic factors of academic-related skills, academic self-confidence, academic goals, institutional commitment, social support, certain contextual influences (institutional selectivity and financial support), and social involvement all had a positive relationship to retention.

According to the study by (Mrara, 2010), some factors causing high staff turnover are; The job not matching new employee's expectations, A lack of attention from line managers, A lack of training, Lack of autonomy, Lack of challenge and variety within the work, Disappointment with the promotion and development opportunities, Disappointment with standards of management, including unapproachable, uncaring and distant behavior and a failure to consult.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Description of the Study Area and Justification

This study was conducted in Iringa region in Tanzania, selected universities being University of Iringa (UoI), Ruaha Catholic University (RUCU) and Mkwawa University College of Education (MUCE), within Iringa municipality. UoI is an institution of higher learning owned and managed by Evangelical Lutheran church of Tanzania (ELCT). UoI was inaugurated in 2013 as a fully-fledged university from Iringa University College (IUCo), which was established in 1994. MUCE was established as a constituent college of the University of Dar es salaam (UDSM) on the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2005 by upgrading the former Mkwawa High School. RUCU was established by the Tanzania Episcopal Conference (TEC) under its Trust Deed of the Registered Trustees of Ruaha University College who are the trustees of SAUT, through the generous support of well-wishers (friends of RUCO) within and outside the country.

Authors of this study decided to choose the three different universities so as to determine whether factors leading to academic staff motivation and retention in one University are the same as to another university, or in public universities are the same as private universities, bearing in mind that MUCE is a public institution and a branch of University of Dar es salaam (UDSM), RUCU is a private - faith based organization owned by Roman Catholic, and UoI is a private faith based organization owned by Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania (ELCT) Iringa Diocese.

The selected Universities were preferred by the researchers due to their adequate number of academic staff, and accessibility.

### 3.2. Research Design

Research design is an arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance with the research purpose. It specifies the methods and procedures for the collection, measurement, and analysis of data (Mohamed et al., 2017). The study employed a cross-sectional research design. It used both quantitative and qualitative tools. Both questionnaires and interviews were used as instruments of the study. Quantitative approach was used when administering questionnaires to academic staff while qualitative approach was employed through interview to the management members of the universities, specifically administrators for academics and human resource/ personnel officers.

### 3.3. Population, Sample and Sampling Procedures

#### 3.3.1. Target Population

Population is a group of individuals who have one or more similar characteristics who have equal chance to be selected in the sample of the study (Maneno, 2018). Target population is that population to which a researcher wants to generalize the results of the study. It is a universal set of the study of all members of real or hypothetical set of people,

events or objects to which an investigation wishes to generalize the results (Mohamed et al., 2017). Targeted population under this study was the academic staff in selected universities including professors, associate professors, lecturers, assistant lecturers, and tutorial assistants, with a total number of 456 academic staff as summarized in the Table 1 below.

No	Rank	UoI	MUCE	RUCU	Total
1	Professor	2	3	2	7
2	Associate Professor	-	-	1	1
3	Senior Lecturers	5	4	9	18
4	Lecturers	16	18	28	62
5	Assistant Lecturers	87	125	63	275
6	Tutorials	24	13	56	93
	Total	134	163	159	456

*Table 1: The Targeted Population under the Study*

*Source: Human Resource Department of Respective Universities, 2014/2015*

### 3.3.2. Sample and Sampling Procedure

#### 3.3.2.1. Sample

A sample can be defined as a group which is selected from the population while remaining as representative as possible (Maneno, 2018). Sampling refers to the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals selected represent the large group from which they were selected (Mohamed et al., 2017). Sampling procedure is a process used to select some elements of a population in such a way that they represent actual characteristics of the entire population (Maneno, 2018).

#### 3.3.2.2. Sample Selection and Sample Size

The three universities under the study comprised a total of 456 academic staff. Therefore, this study had a sample size of 217 respondents who represented the whole population in the area of study.

#### 3.3.2.3. Sampling Techniques

The researchers employed stratified random sampling and simple random sampling so as to eliminate biasness since equal chance of inclusion in the sample was provided to the population. Purposive sampling was employed as well since researchers aimed at obtaining information from respondents who are considered to have ideas of the problem under the study, like management members specifically administrative officers for academic staff.

### 3.3.3. Data Collection Procedure

Researchers used both primary and secondary source of data. Primary data were used when administering questionnaires and interview. Secondary source of data was used when collecting data through documentary analysis.

### 3.3.4. Data Analysis Procedure

Data analysis is the ordering of data into constituent parts in order to obtain answers in research question (Mohamed et al., 2017). After data collection, data were cleaned, coded and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Spread Sheets. Frequencies and factor analysis were run. In order to measure nominal and ordinal data, frequencies were preferred especially for data like gender and age groups. For factor analysis tool was used to accommodate attitudinal questions as employed in the study. Motivation and retention factors were tested using the Pearson's correlation to establish the relationship between the factors and the dependent variable and the influence of each factor on the dependent variable.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

A total of 217 questionnaires were administered to the academic staff among the three universities. 200 participants completed the survey, that is 92.2% (n=200) of response rate.

### *4.1. Respondents' Profile*

In the first part of the questionnaires, the informants were asked to provide personal information. The participants responded to many items appropriately, though they provided different opinions.

#### 4.1.1. Gender

The findings indicate that there are many male academic staff than female, which is 72.5% and 27.5% respectively. This may imply that males are more interested in teaching High Learning Institutions than females.

#### 4.1.2. Age

Many academic staff are between 25-34 years of age which is 47% followed by 35-44 year of age with 30%. This implies that many academic staff are still young and therefore they are mobile (it is easy for them to move from one employer to another). Motivation and retention factors are more important in this situation.

#### 4.1.3. Marital Status

In regards to respondents' marital status, many respondents were married 67%, followed by single 28.5%, divorced 2.5% and widow/er 2%. This tells that the mobile category (single) is smaller than the anticipated retained (married) though it may affect staff turnover in the organization.

#### 4.1.4. Academic Rank

Results show that 60% were Assistant Lecturers, 22% Tutorial Assistant, 14.5% Lecturers, 3% Senior Lecturers and 5% Professors. This information may as well imply that having bigger percent of Assistant Lectures followed by Tutorial Assistants, the training development is inevitable to retain them bearing in mind that this group falls between the ages of 25 to 44 years of age.

#### 4.1.5. Duration of Academic Staff with the Current Employer

Findings shows that, duration of academic staff with the current employer, 49% were between 5-9 years of work, 37.5% below 5 years, 9.5% between 10-14 years, and 4% have worked for 15 years and above. The findings tell that about half of the respondents have been with their current university between 5-9 years which is enough to have institutional memory.

#### 4.2. Factors Determining Academic Staff Motivation and Retention

The academic staff were asked about the factors and to what extent each factor motivates them to stay in or leave their current universities. Responses helped the researchers to determine the leading factor. Below are the motivation factors that have been presented;

##### 4.2.1. Promotion Practice

Promotion practice is among the five motivation and retention factors under discussion. General findings have indicated that promotion practices contribute in low retention of academic staff among the sampled universities as Pearson correlation confirms the significant negative relationship between promotion practices and academic staff intention to leave.

The research findings show that many academic staff in higher learning institutions seem to be placed in low rank in relation to their qualifications, skills and their work experience in relation to promotion. They believe that they deserve to be in a better and right position. In most cases the promotion process is conducted unfairly, inconsistently and not transparently, whereas in many cases promotions are not provided based on merits. This situation influences academic staff intention to leave their current employer. But the reason behind to why they are not promoted timely is purely administrative where processes and systems need to support staff retention. The study regards promotion as one of the key factors for staff retention and therefore universities need not to under rate it. Response of the three questions on this particular factor is shown in Table 2.

S/N	Promotion practice	University	Percentages on Scale						Total
			SA	A	BA	BD	DA	SD	
1	The promotion process	UoI	1.7	11.9	10.2	18.6	39	18.6	100
	is conducted fairly and	RUCU	5.8	30.4	11.5	13.1	31.9	7.3	100
	transparently.	MUCE	11.1	48.6	5.1	10.2	19.4	5.6	100
		Total	6.5	31.5	8.8	13.7	29.5	10	100
2	Promotions is given on	UoI	5.1	28.8	15	20.6	20.3	10.2	100
	merits basis.	RUCU	13	34.8	2.1	18.2	26.1	5.8	100
		MUCE	18.1	45.8	8.1	14.1	9.7	4.2	100
		Total	12.5	37	8.2	17.3	18.5	6.5	100
3	Promotion practice motivate	UoI	1.6	13.6	12.2	28.8	47.5	8.5	100
	me to stay with the current	RUCU	8.7	27.5	13.1	23.2	36.2	4.4	100
	employer.	MUCE	4.2	38.9	21.3	31.9	15.3	9.7	100
		Total	5	27.5	15.6	12.4	32	7.5	100

Table 2: Promotion Practice

Note: SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, BA - Barely Agree, BD - Barely Disagree: DA - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree

##### 4.2.1.1. The Promotion Process Is Conducted Fairly and Transparent

It is established that in greater percentage 53.2% disagree that the promotion process was fairly and transparently conducted. However, detailed information shows the variation of result from one university to another

whereby at MUCE 64.8% claimed to agree while for UoI and RUCU they disagree at 76.2% and 52.3% respectively. This result tells that promotion process at MUCE is fairly and transparently conducted to some extent compared to UoI and RUCU.

#### 4.2.1.2. Promotions Are Given on Merit Basis

57.7% agreed that promotion was given based on merits. This response means that to some extent merits are considered in promotion process among the three universities. But the situation at UoI and RUCU were quite different because in greater percent they disagreed as 51.1% and 50.1% respectively responded to disagree, while MUCE agreed by 72%. However, MUCE is a public institution and therefore its operation is regulated by public authorities.

#### 4.2.1.3. Promotion Practices Motivate Academic Staff to Stay

The findings show that 51.9% of respondents disagreed with the point that promotion practices motivate them to stay with their organizations. Detailed information shows the variation of disagree responses among the universities whereas at UoI and RUCU were 72.6% and 50.7% respectively, unlike MUCE who agree at 64.4% that promotion practiced motivates them to stay with their current university.

#### 4.2.2. Orientation and Induction

Orientation and Induction is a special case as it is revealed in this study that it does not contribute to the academic staff intention to leave or stay, because universities in most cases do not conduct orientation and induction course. Researchers believe that ignorance of staff on orientation and induction plays a greater role to why this is not a factor. Had it been that the staff were aware of what orientation and induction are, the rating for this factor would have been different.

##### 4.2.2.1. Orientation Courses Are Conducted to Newly Recruited Academic Staff

The findings show that 78.3% of the respondents disagreed the fact that orientation courses are conducted to newly recruit academic staff. Detailed information shows the same situation in all the three universities whereas respondent from MUCE disagree by 85.9%, RUCU by 77.3% and UoI by 69.8%. This situation means that orientation courses if any are not effectively or consistently conducted.

##### 4.2.2.2. Induction Courses Are Conducted To Newly Recruit Academic Staff

The finding show that 75.6% Of Respondentsdisagreed that induction courses are conducted to newly recruit academic staff. The situation at UoI is somehow better compared to that of RUCU and MUCE whereas 64%, 74.3% and 86.4% respectively were the response of disagree to the fact above. This situation tells that induction courses if any, are not effectively conducted or consistency is in question thereof.

##### 4.2.2.3. Orientation and Induction Offered Are Comprehensive and Informative

The greater percentage of the responds disagree with the said issue. 84.6% of respondents disagreed that even for those who were offered the courses claims that they were neither comprehensive nor informative. The situation at UoI is somehow better compared to that of RUCU and MUCE whereas 75.4%, 86.2.3% and 91.1% respectively were the response of disagree to the fact above.

##### 4.2.2.4. My Confidence at Work Is a Result of Orientation and Induction Courses Offered to Me on My Arrival to This University

87.8% of the respondents disagreed that orientation and induction offered is the results of their confidence at work, as shown before that orientation and induction are not well conducted/ not conducted to newly recruit academic staff. Thus 81.2% of the respondents from UoI, 87% from RUCU and 93.7% from MUCE disagreed with the statement that their confidence at work is a result of orientation and induction offered to them. This means that academic staffs get oriented and inducted through difficulties and it may affect their performance as well as their morale to work and probably they may think of leaving their current employer eventually.

##### 4.2.2.5. Orientation and Induction Courses Are a Factor to My Retention

Many respondents (87.4%) disagree to the fact that orientation and induction courses offered to them are a factor to their retention in their current universities since they were neither oriented nor inducted. However, 96.7% of the respondents from MUCE, 82.6% from UoI and 81.6% from RUCU disagreed.

#### 4.2.3. Feedback Systems

Respondents were asked questions so as to determine whether or not academic staff were provided with feedback effectively, especially on matters concerning to their work-related issues. The findings revealed that academic staffs in HLIs were not motivated through feedback systems. The correlation analysis indicates that there is significant negative relationship between feedback system and academic staff intention to leave. Details are shown in table 3 below.

S/N	Feedback Systems	University	Percentages on Scale						Total
			SA	A	BA	BD	DA	SD	
1	Feedback on work related issues to academic staff is Provided	UoI	1.7	20.3	10.5	18.3	35.6	13.6	100
		RUCU	2.9	26.1	9.4	31.2	27.5	2.9	100
		MUCE	2.8	40.2	21.5	14.6	15.3	5.6	100
		Total	2.5	29.5	13.5	22	25.5	7	100
		UoI	1.7	8.5	12.3	19.8	40.7	17	100
2	Feedbacks is given timely	RUCU	2.9	31.9	2.1	31.2	30.4	1.5	100
		MUCE	1.4	34.7	21.4	20.3	20.8	1.4	100
		Total	2	26	12	24	30	6	100

Table 3: Feedback System

Note: SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, BA - Barely Agree, BD - Barely Disagree: DA - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree

#### 4.2.3.1. Feedback on Work Related Issues to Academic Staff Is Provided

54.5% of the respondents did not agree with the fact that feedback practices to issues related to academic staff is provided and as a result these staff have outstanding claims/ complaints that need attention and therefore contribute to low work morale. Results show that MUCE staffs are not affected much with this factor since in greater percentage (64.5%) claimed to agree. Unlike UoI and RUCU where 67.5% and 61.6% respectively disagreed to be provided with feedback on issues related to academic staff. This implies that the situation at MUCE is favorable in comparison to UoI and RUCU. But MUCE is publicly owned institution and therefore its arrangements may be different from others who are privately owned like RUCU and UoI.

#### 4.2.3.2. Feedbacks Are Given Timely

60% of respondents disagreed to the point that feedback were given timely. Detailed information shows that 77.5% from UoI disagreed, 43.1% from RUCU disagreed while the situation at MUCE is somehow different since in bigger percent (57.5%) agree that feedback is given timely. This information implies that even for the small percentage of feedback was provided in relation to issues related to academic staff, it was not timely provided at UoI and RUCU.

#### 4.2.4. Academic Staff Expectations

Under this motivation factor, respondents were asked a number of questions so as to determine whether expectations of academic staff are being met and as a result they are still working for their current organizations.

The correlation analysis indicates that there is significant negative relationship between academic staff expectation and academic staff intention to leave. The research findings revealed that many academic staff had their expectations at the beginning of their employment but eventually they were not met and they are not supported by the university administration except the gain experience and get exposure through interacting professionally at work and to some extent the social welfare needs like medical insurance and ceremonial matters. That is to say the management does not care much in managing academic staff expectations in private universities. When people are employed, they tend to establish some expectations and once they see no sign of meeting the same, they become passive at work so this study suggests that management needs to be open and learn staff expectations by linking with organizational ones. Management need to be consistent in treating staff welfare and improve communication to avoid rumors and or mistrust. Table 4 presents the findings.

S/N	Academic Staff Expectation	University	Percentages on Scale (n=200)						Total
			SA	A	BA	BD	DA	SD	
1	The expectations I had at the beginning of my employment	UoI	5.1	35.6	10.2	10.1	28.8	10.2	100
		RUCU	5.8	33.3	12	14.1	24.6	10.2	100
		MUCE	5.6	59.7	13.4	10.2	9.7	1.4	100
		Total	5.5	43.5	12	11.5	20.5	7	100
2	My expectations are being supported by the university Administration	UoI	6.8	28.8	11.3	12.4	28.8	11.9	100
		RUCU	4.4	43.5	1.8	30.1	10.1	10.1	100
		MUCE	1.4	56.9	10.4	10.4	18.1	2.8	100
		Total	4	44	7.8	17.7	18.5	8	100

Table 4: Academic Staff Expectation

Note: SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, BA - Barely Agree, BD - Barely Disagree: DA - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree

#### 4.2.4.1. The Expectations I Had at the Beginning of My Employment Are Being Met

The findings show that 61% of the respondents agreed that their expectations they had at the beginning of the employment have been met and therefore it is one of the factors for their retention at current job/ organizations. But there are variations among universities whereas the situation at MUCE is more favorable with 78.7% followed by RUCU with 51.1%, and thereafter UoI with 50.9%.

#### 4.2.4.2. My Expectations Are Being Supported by the University Administration

55.8% of the respondents claimed to agree with the fact that their expectations are being supported by their university administration. Detailed information reveals the variation of the response that 68.7% at MUCE agree unlike respondents from UoI and RUCU who disagreed at 53.1% and 50.3%, respectively.

#### 4.2.5. Training and Development Programme

Training and Development Programme was another motivation factor found to contribute the intention of academic staff to leave. Under this motivation and retention factor for academic staff, respondents were asked a number of questions. The correlation analysis indicates that there is significant negative relationship between training and development programme and academic staff intention to leave.

##### 4.2.5.1. There Is an Effective Training and Development Programme

The findings show that 53.3% of the respondents agreed to the fact that training and development programs are effective. Detailed information demonstrates that at MUCE 61.8% of the respondent agree and at RUCU 51.2% also agree unlike for UoI where 54.6% disagree. This may imply that such factor helps in retaining potential staff.

##### 4.2.5.2. Coaching and Mentoring Are Provided in This University

The findings illustrate that 58% of the respondents disagreed with the issue that there is coaching and mentoring sessions within the universities. Detailed information explains that 64.1% at UoI, 55.9% at MUCE, and 55.4% at RUCU disagree with the mentioned fact. This tells that other staffs are coached and mentored while others are not and therefore inconsistency is in question thereof. This situation might influence academic staff to leave.

#### 4.2.6. Intentions to Leave (Motivated and Retained Academic Staff)

Motivated and retained academic staff was the dependent variable whereas in setting questionnaires the variable was termed as intention to leave. Researchers wanted to establish a number of academic staff who wishes to leave because of any factor among the motivation factors included under this study.

##### 4.2.6.1. I Will Probably Look for a Job at Another University in the Next Year

Generally, 78.4% of the respondents disagreed to look for a job at another university, while 21.6% agreed. The situation varies from one university to another whereas 9.4% from MUCE, 18.7% from RUCU and 40.2% from UoI are planning to leave their jobs/ or change university.

##### 4.2.6.2. It Is Likely That I Will Take Steps During the Next Year to Secure a Different Job (Profession) in a Different Organization

75% of the respondents are not planning to secure a different job/ profession elsewhere but 25% do. Detailed information shows that 36% of the respondent from UoI, 23.3% from RUCU and 17.8% from MUCE have plans to secure different jobs/ profession.

##### 4.2.6.3. I Am on My Way to Look for another Job Any Time from Now

The findings show that 68.7% disagree and 31.3% do agree to the fact that they are on their way to look for another job any time from now. Detailed information shows the variation as follows; 21.3% from MUCE, 31.1% from RUCU, and 44.3% from UoI are on their way to look for another job any time from now. This tells that, one third of staff may leave if need be and therefore affect staff turnover.

#### 4.2.7. Relationship between Motivation Factors and Academic Staff Intention to Leave (Motivated and Retained Academic Staff)

The Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed using the bivariate correlation technique which was carried out using SPSS program with the two-tailed test. The value of correlation coefficient varies from -1 to +1. A value of zero or nearly zero indicates no relationship between the variables. Therefore, a value greater than 0.60 is regarded as highly correlated, a value between 0.30 to 0.60 shows medium correlation, and a value lower than 0.30 is considered as poorly correlated.

To analyze the relationship between the five motivation and retention factors and the dependent variable, Pearson correlation was conducted among the variables. The results of correlation analysis indicated that there is a significant negative relationship between promotion practice and employees' intention to leave ( $r = -0.363$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ). Therefore, it can be concluded that the relationship between promotion practice and intention to leave is negative. The relationship between the two variable is statistically significant at  $\alpha = 1\%$ .

The results of correlation analysis indicated that the relationship between orientation and induction and employees' intention to leave is not significant ( $r = 0.045$ ,  $p = 0.523$ ). Therefore, it can be inferred that there is no significant relationship between orientation and induction and intention to leave.

The results of correlation analysis indicate that there is a significant negative relationship between feedback system and employees' intention to leave ( $r = -0.318$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ). Therefore, it can be inferred that the relationship between feedback system and intention to leave is negative. The relationship between the two variables is statistically significant at  $\alpha = 1\%$ . The results of correlation analysis indicate that there is a significant negative relationship between academic staff expectation and employees' intention to leave ( $r = -0.451$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ). Therefore, it can be inferred that the relationship between feedback system and intention to leave is negative.

The results of correlation analysis indicate that there is a significant negative relationship between training and development programme and employees' intention to leave ( $r = -0.238$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Therefore, it can be inferred that the relationship between feedback system and intention to leave is negative. The relationship between the two variable is statistically significant at  $\alpha = 1\%$ .

#### 4.2.7.1. Factors Determining Academic Staff Motivation and Retention

The study identified and discussed Training and development, academic staff expectation, promotion practices, feedback system, Orientation and induction, as the factors to be examined.

### 5. Conclusion

This study identified and discussed the factors affecting academic staff motivation and retention among universities in Iringa Municipality. Those factors are; Training and development, academic staff expectation, promotion practices, feedback system, and Orientation and induction. After examining the motivation and retention factors to what extent they contribute to the academic staff intention to leave (motivated and retained academic staff), the study found that unmet academic staff expectations are leading factors followed by unsteady promotion practices, feedback system, and lastly training and development.

MUCE seem to have relative high motivation and retention than RUCU and UoI. The UoI may have been affected by the ongoing transition that management was under reshuffle exercise and so many staffs at different levels were tense about their future and as a result the work morale was very down, and intention to leave was high. Human beings need special attention when dealing with motivation and retention. They are rational and have feelings. What they deserve need to be provided and even more can be done bearing in mind that there is organization competition for growth, expansion and prosperity. Therefore, it is imperative for universities and any related organizations to keep an eye on issues that may bring about staff turnover and be vigilant as the case may be.

### 6. Recommendations

Based on the above findings the following recommendations are made

- Motivating seniority by providing incentives might help the Universities to retain experienced staff longer.
- Universities should improve their performance evaluation systems by setting clear criteria for evaluation. In addition, the results (feedback) of performance evaluation should be communicated timely to the staff.
- The universities should value and recognize the academic staff for their contribution(s). This can be done through promotion, giving prize, publicly and acknowledgement in their different publications.
- The universities should take remedial measures that would enhance a kind of working environment in which every member of the academic staff is treated fairly and properly which avoids sense of discrimination, the consequence of which is alienation.

### 7. Acknowledgments

My thanks to the peer blind reviewers.

### 8. References

- i. Ajmal, m. M., shamim, m., &saleh, m. (2016). Journal of behavioural sciences. Journal of behavioural sciences, 26(2), 1-15.
- ii. Bayissa, w., &zewdie, s. (2009). Academic staff reward system : a case of jimma university. Ethiop. J. Educ. & sc., 6(1), 13-27.
- iii. Bernard, b. (2012). Factors that determine academic staff retention and commitment in private tertiary institutions in botswana : empirical review. Global advanced research journal of of management and business studies, 1(9), 278-299.
- iv. Edabu, p., &anumaka, i. B. (2014). Motivation tools as a determinant of effectiveness on academic staff in selected private universities in central uganda. International journal of research in business management, 2(9), 81-94.
- v. Guma, p. V. (2011). Organisational factors impacting on employee retention (vol. 66, issue January). Nelson mandela metropolitan university.
- vi. Hebenstreit, r. K. (2008). A call to apply the principles of the enneagram in organizations to attract, retain, and motivate employees. The enneagram journal, summer, 11-18.



- vii. Humphreys, j., wakerman, j., pashen, d., & buykx, p. (2009). The Australian national university centre for remote health, Alice Springs Mtisa centre for rural and remote health retention strategies & incentives for health workers in rural & remote areas : what works ? Australian primary health care research insti (issue November).
- viii. Mak, b. L., & sockel, h. (2001). A confirmatory factor analysis of is employee motivation and retention. *Information & management*, 38, 265–276.
- ix. Maneno, g. S. (2018). Employees' motivation and retention among members of academic staff from selected private higher learning institutions (hlis) in Tanzania. The open university of Tanzania.
- x. Mohamed, r., ngui, t. K., & mulili, b. (2017). Factors determining employee retention in the banking sector: a case study of agricultural bank of Sudan. *Journal of education & entrepreneurship*, 4(10), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.26762/jee.2017.400000001>
- xi. Mrara, m. T. (2010). An investigation of turnover and retention factors of health professional staff within the Eastern Cape department of health (issue April). Rhodes university.
- xii. Němečková, i. (2017). The role of benefits in employee motivation and retention in the financial sector of the Czech republic. *Economic research-ekonomikaistraživanja*, 30(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677x.2017.1314827>
- xiii. Noordin, f., & Jusoff, k. (1991). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian social science*, 5(5), 122–128.
- xiv. Omotayo, o. A., Salau, o. P., & Hezekiah, f. &. (2014). Modeling the relationship between motivating factors; employee' retention; and job satisfaction in the Nigerian banking industry. *Journal of management policies and practices*, 2(2), 63–83.
- xv. Osakwe, r. N. (2014). Factors affecting motivation and job satisfaction of academic staff of universities in south-south geopolitical zone of Nigeria. *International education studies*, 7(7), 43–51. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n7p43>
- xvi. Robbins, v. A., b., l. S., & Noeth, r. J. (2001). The role of academic and non-academic factors in improving college retention.