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ABSTRACT
The main objective of the study was to determine the determinants of employee turnover in the selected Kenyan public universities. The study was carried out in three selected Kenyan public universities of Masinde Muliro University, Maseno University and Kibabii University. The study targeted a total population of 2274 correspondents comprising of teaching and non-teaching staff. The study employed descriptive research design where stratified random sampling was used to group the universities and purposive sampling used to identify the correspondence with the required information. To avoid biasness, random sampling was used to identify the sample. A sample of 340 correspondence obtained using Yamane’s formula. Pilot study was carried out in Mt. Kenya University where a valid measure of 0.5 spearman correlation coefficient was acceptable as a valid measure and 0.7 Cronbach’s alpha value was accepted as reliable value. Questionnaires and interviews were the main instruments of data collection. The data was analyzed using SPSS where descriptive statistics of frequencies, charts, percentages and means and inferential statistics of chi-square and regression analysis where the null hypothesis was tested at 5% level of significance. The results showed that for every unit increase in job satisfaction there was a corresponding increase in employee turnover by 1.070, work environment, which was important in predicting of Employee turnover as indicated by significance value=0.000 which was less than 0.05 level of significance (p=0.000<0.05). For every unit increase in work flexibility there was a corresponding increase in employee turnover by 0.803. The findings of the study would help Public University management board and the Government in managing employee turnover in public universities and Human resource practitioners in identifying and implementing better terms in public universities.
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INTRODUCTION
Totally, with the existing development in the world, establishments are facing shift demands, dynamic settings, increasing rivalry and technological progressions, are generating employee’s turnover amongst its workforces (Benn, Dunphy & Griffiths, 2014). Nyamubarwa (2013) in his studies determined that turnover has developed to be major subject of concern with professors, human resource management, and social researchers. Mughal (2015) verified further that turnover has established major hesitation of employees, management and organization’s currently where employee turnover is supported around up with satisfactory determining variables. Human resource is believed to give a competitive advantage to firms because in invention related capacities it takes human capital into justification.

However, Danish and Usman (2010) classifies that employees are important assets in a working setting as they contribute to its development and success of achieving its stated goals and objectives. According to Gangaram (2016) shows that ditching of employees from some establishment indicates that the establishment has griefs though its speeded up by certain extensive characteristics but examining on them can reduced turnover. Turnover is a thoughtful realization of employees to explore for other alternative jobs in other allied or non-allied organizations (Aondoaver & Onyishi, 2012).

Allen (2013) found that employee turnover is a resilient predictor of actual turnover in a working environment of and organization, where there is a probability that an individual will leave the current job. Park et al. (2014) ascertains that various studies prefer to have an employee turnover as a substitution of actual turnover. Employees consequently have an assessment of turnover in institutes all through their working age when they intellect that they are not realizing there need.

According to Armstrong (2010) observations employee turnover is normal rate of movement of workers in and out of society in a any working sector. Siddiqi (2013) defines that pulling out is a process of feelings of job pursuit behavior heights and turnover on that precedes actual turnover. The early turnover progression approach was familiarized by March and Simon 1958 as recommended by (Hom, 2012). Employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs owing to certain key aspects that develop both negative and positive attitudes to their jobs both to stay or quit (Davoudi, Pourbrahimi & Rastgar, 2012).

Employees start considering resources of capability when they develop turnover intentions either to quit and find another job elsewhere of or stay, of which will likely position in for turnover. Iravo (2012) in his studies stressed that progressive learning in higher institutes have a bulk number of students undertaking higher education minus the reliable upsurge in manpower leading to employee turnover among staff. Saeed (2014) maintenances that developing countries like Pakistan unemployment level is higher and such organizations cannot decrease rate of employee turnover to 0%.

Job satisfaction is the gracious of satisfaction of employee’s sense with their job content (Nishide & Puangyoykeaw, 2015). According to Satinder (2013) employers have attempted to consider job satisfaction in their survival of their organizations once it has some relationship with the employee turnover. Satisfied workers contribute well and have a positive attitude towards their job in an organization. Recently, Suifan et al. (2016) examined the influence of work flexibility and turnover in private hospitals with the mediating role of work life conflict in Jordan. The study proved a significant relationship among work life conflict and turnover. Moreover, Khanin (2013) encourages that an organization that builds an employee turnover among its employee’s results into damages of its technical knowhow to equivalent competitors.
Statement of the Research Problem

Generally, in today’s competitive world organizations are spending a lot costs on time and on employee satisfaction in an effort to maintain the competitive advantage and achieve organization’s goal. Studies have been carried out globally on employee turnover in higher learning institutions to improve output level (Arif & Faroqi, 2014). Currently, Kenyan Public universities are facing challenges of employee turnover from competitive firms both public and private and incurring costs on time, hiring among others. Evident by (Kipkebut, 2010) mentions that bad governance, poor salary, weighty load, job dissatisfaction, lack of work flexibility among others. Hehe (2012) confirms that Kenyan Public Universities have poor service delivery, injustice, corruption, creating turnover. This is evidently complaints office (Ombudsman) set in all public universities due to corruption, over working, poor pay, among others (Orute, 2012). The last few years ago university chapters UASU, KUSU and KUDHEIHA have been calling for the strike for management not meeting the agreements declared their CBA i.e. working conditions, salary scales, and working environment (Kagusia.,2013) This strike affects the academic schedule in the university; workers are forced to work extra hours with heavy workload with no compensation. Iravo (2012) proves that universities are schedule academic programs, incur costs in time, recruitment, among others. Steadman (2007) asserts in his baseline survey of local Kenyan Public universities that staff satisfaction stood at 63.6% teaching and 64% for non-teaching staff. Ng’ethe (2012) confirms that records of public universities between 2006 to 2011 lost staff of academic as follows; EU lost 102 staff, JKAUT lost 100 staff, KU lost 121 staff, MU lost 124 staff, MMUST lost 88staff, Moi University lost100 staff, Nairobi University lost 100 staff. Ng’ethe et al. (2012) found that11% turnover on public university academic staff significantly affects the output performance of the institutions. Studies both locally and abroad were limited to employee turnover on academic staff thus why there was need to find out determinants of employee turnover in Kenyan Public Universities targeting both teaching and non-teaching employees.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out the determinants of employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities. The specific objectives were:-

- To investigate the effect of Job satisfaction on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.
- To establish the effects of working environment on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.
- To determine effects of supervisory support on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.
- To assess effects of work flexibility on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.

Research Hypotheses

- $H_{01}$: Job satisfaction has no significant effect on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.
- $H_{02}$: Work environment has no significant effect on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.
- $H_{03}$: Supervisory support has no significant effects on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.
- $H_{04}$: Work-flexibility has no significant effects on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

The Spillover – Crossover Model
This model is to safeguard an employee to flourish and negotiate stability in his or her work and her family life to escape the incapacity that results of turnover. The SCM model, studies and theories have been combined, ensuing in a model that suggests that services in the working area spills over to the family area (Balunos etal.2015). Most, studies have brought about consequences that uphold the SCM. However, study efforts are mostly devoted to studying the negative spillover and crossover. According to Bakker, Demerouti and Voydanoff (2010) conclude that work performance is affected with the personal roles when work capacity and emotional weights increase in societies.

According to Balunos et al .(2015) the level of demands at home which comprises; personal roles, family roles, overload of housework tasks among others result to negative behaviors of the employee, in which the employee experiences higher levels of exhaustion at work place. Taino et al. (2015) describes that positive spill over is where employees affiliations with individual environment and family life positively effects the level of satisfaction at work.

**Expectancy Theory**

Employees have individuals various sets of aims and can be driven if they have positive expectations. This theory is about choice (Victor vroom’s expectancy theory (1961), Expectancy theory considers that the strength of a leaning to act in a certain way relies on the strong grounds of an expectancy that the act will be tailed by a given outcome and pulling of the outcome to the individual. This theory includes three variables namely, attractiveness, performance-reward linkage and effort-performance linkage. Thus, whether one has the desire to produce at any given time relies on one’s specific aims and one’s insight of the relative worth of performing his duty as a trail to the realization of those aims.

The theory has generally four stages. First, what are the purported benefits does the job offer to the employee. The benefits may be good such as pay, security, work flexibility, conducive work environment, opportunities to use skills among others or negative such as no communication, harsh supervisory support, treat of dismissal corruption among others. Secondly, in what way does an individual consider these benefits as attractive? The individual, who finds a certain benefits attractive; that is positively appreciated will prefer attaining it.

**Equity Theory**

The theory has been indorsed by Adams, S. J.in 1963. Clarification of this theory has been clarified by (Mamah et al., 2015) among others. The theory's expectations are built on the symptom that in addition to being satisfied for their performance, employees normally would want also those return of their services to be fair and just fairly to what other similar employees with similar status and in similar firm’s stake. The theory discovers four tools for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as; First, employees pursue to generate best use of their outcomes. Secondly, groups can maximize pooled recompenses by increasing accepted systems for equitably distributing compensations and costs among workers. Systems of equity will develop within groups, and members will attempt to prompt other members to accept and adhere to these systems. Thirdly, when workers discover themselves involving in biased relationships with the employers, they develop dissatisfied.

The theory explains that in this situation, both the person who gets higher and the person who gets lower feel dissatisfied. The employee who receives higher may have an imprint of being a shamed or guilt and the employee who receives lower may feel irritated. Lastly, Employees who perceive that they are in a partial relationship efforts to removing their dissatisfaction by restoring equity could be complete by either by corrupting inputs, outputs, or employee’s quitting the organization. The need for just handling
is therefore the basis for equity. Equity theory concerns pay as an end result.
The argument is that people generally work well when they view the recompense given to them is fair (Armstrong, 2012). Further, the description states that employees struggle hard to achieve and maintain a state of equity or fairness in order to sustain an internal psychological stability. The individuals, in this situation who are employees, must trust that in terms of pay and other kinds of return they are get equal or fair or just to what such additional to the process that brings the payments.

Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Employee Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Satisfaction</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>Stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Work Arrangement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Variables

Job Satisfaction

Generally, institutions develop competitive packages of better pay and benefits for good creation of employee loyal with the employer to generate job satisfaction. Borah (2012) referred job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional feeling of an employee whereas Gupta and Sethi termed job satisfaction as a response of an individual towards work (Gupta & Sethi, 2012). According to (Pandey, 2012) job satisfaction is an important tool in the field of organization behavior.

Job satisfaction and turnover is initiated by the antecedents that are in the withdrawal development that forecast voluntary employee turnover (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). Employees with high altitudes of job satisfaction have optimistic attitudes towards their jobs, while those with job dissatisfaction have destructive attitudes towards their job (Mbundu, 2011). Calisir et al. (2011) asserts that salaries and incentives are the most important determinants of job satisfaction of an employee that can reduce turnover.

Job satisfaction is the level of satisfaction workers feel with their current jobs or the content of their job with any organization (Nishinde, et al., 2015). Most studies have identified that job satisfaction can influence employee turnover, absenteeism, life satisfaction, pay satisfaction among others. According to Nishinde et al. (2015) noted that Lopa et al., (2001) cited in their studies that job satisfaction may be the most construct in attempting to understand turnover.

Work Environment

Currently organizations are financially capitalizing heavily in work environment scopes and instigating involvement’s to empower employees in regard to turnover (Marielle, 2014). Work environment has physical and compliant environments that touch the healthiness of workers (Oludeyi, 2015). However, Chandrasekhar (2011) asserts that employee maybe influenced with factors that extent there inaccuracy rate, level of innovation, collaboration with other employees and the level of their stay in an organization.

Working conditions bring various positive and negative effects on employee’s outcomes such as employee turnover. Uche et al. (2013) work
environment has equally been associated with turnover. Ojo et al. (2015) disputes that employees will develop advanced turnover when they feel that they are taken advantage of, underrated, ignored, helpless or insignificant.

Oludayo and Omonijo, (2013) strained that the significance of human resources in any work environment is to value and consider employees to reduce the intentional turnover among staff both private and public industries. When employees are valued and their importance is considered in organization they will have the intention to stay. Barkov et al. (2014), indicates that varied research have various working samples that show perceived work conditions may have positive and negative impact that effect employee turnover among employees.

**Supervisory Support**

Mistreatment represents serious problem troubling modern organizations owing to poor relationship among subordinates, supervisors and overall work environment. Furthermore, this type of supervision refers to convergence of two prominent field of research Supervisors are supportive, inspiring and let employees learn from mistakes and have a sense of pride in their jobs (Krishnan & Umamaheswari, 2015). Rothmann (2011) perceives a decrease of intended turnover among employees in institution where influences such as supervisory support, participation in decision making and role clarity are identified and supported. Kumar (2014) perceived that when supervisory support is low intentional turnover in organization becomes significant.

Asif and Hussain (2012) quantified that turnover intentions are reduced when sense of belongingness in organization and supervisory support is encouraged, employees will remain and feel fit to work. Paille (2010) contributed that institutions should have that trust, support employees and give contribution of concern for their well-being. Supervisors can substitute for inventive responses to unforeseen changes by providing a supportive climate for their employees (Gundry, Munoz Fernandez, Ofstein, Ortega-Egea, 2015).

**Work Flexibility**

Universities can only have a decrease turnover among employees if there is a work-flexibility which is an important component in both working condition and personal fulfillment (Hannah & James, 2013). According to Suifan et al. (2016) argued that the word Work life balance was revamped from what was originally known as work family conflict (WFC). The debate for work-family conflict was kindled with working women who were struggling to have a stability line between their dual roles of wives and mothers and also trying to practice the professional career (Agarwal & Lenka, 2015). The work family conflict was believed to be an issue affecting only working class women in organization (Diab et al., 2015).

However, it didn’t take long before men realized that they were also suffering in balancing of work, family issues, friends, social affairs and leisure activities (Ayman, 2015). Meanwhile, Mansour and Mansour (2009) affirmed that Work- family conflict was later replaced with work- life balance has various constructs which include work flexibility which categorizes work arrangements and other work alternatives among others. In literature since individual life and work could not be seen thoroughly exclusive since the two can co-exist and be stable in a harmonized manner.

Work flexibility comprises matching career demands with individual and family needs (Gupta, 2010). It has been confirmed that work-flexibility has gained reputation for the last two decades towards an employee who wants to balance personal life and work-life (Koubova, 2013). A flexible life is one where we spread our drive and efforts between key areas of importance. Asiedu (2013) emphasized that work life
Employee Turnover

Turnover is a tenacious problem in organizations in this current age of globalization (Chee Long, Foon, Osman, & Yin Fah 2010). Kumar (2014) attests that employees are very critical assets for any type organization with a work environment is currently competitive business environment, it is wise for the organization to study whether employee choose to leave or stay and reason for such. When employees feel dissatisfied at their workplaces, these feeling will be reflected in each individual behavior, and will result in less committed to their works, and in turn will lead them to turnover from the organization physically or mentally (Munir & Rahman, 2015). According to Issa et al. (2013) turnover is a voluntary thought of an employee of voluntary quitting his job which in turn will certainly influence his job performance and could influence productivity level position of an organization. In the current human resource perspective of work setting, employee turnover is the ratio at which employer decrease or increase the number of employees (Kanwar & Kodwani., 2012). It was further indicated that the modest way to define employee turnover is ‘how long the employees stay’ or the rate of traffic through the revolving door’ of which the turnover intent generally results to actual turnover.

Nasir (2015) reveals that employee turnover is the behavioral trends of employees ‘voluntary to leave the organization. Employees who are likely to leave the organization are those who are most talent and smartest within the group (Abassi and Hollman, 2000) as cited in the study of (Thean et al., 2015). According to Alkahtani (2015) found that Andrew Carnegie cited that “the famed industrialist of the 19th Century, who mentioned: Take away my factories, my plants; take a way my railroads, my ships, my transportation, take away my money; strip me of all these but leave me my key employees, and in two three years I will have them again”.

Liu et al. (2010) as cited in the study of Eng, and Kumar (2012) that an organization that has an increase rate in turnover reduces its reputation and increases costs of recruitment new staff. Practically, several establishments which express employee turnover the interaction among employee and the institutions affected. According to Medina, (2012) turnover rate has an inverse relationship with job enactment in an organization.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive survey design and correlation design. In other words, descriptive research defines the research traits viz., who, what, where, when, why and strongly how a descriptive research is to explore and describe accurately the state of affairs as it exists (Kagusia, 2013). The population target for this research consisted of teaching and non-teaching staff of the three selected public Universities. The teaching and non-teaching staff included professors, lecturer, management level, administrators, secretaries, accountants, and technical staff and support staff. The research was self-administered using questionnaires to collect data among staff working within various departments in the main three selected universities. The analyses was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software (Arif & Yasir, 2014).

RESULTS

Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Turnover

The study used the parameters where: The study used the parameters where: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). 2= Disagree (D 3 = Sometimes agree / Sometimes disagree (SA/SD) 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA). A summary of the findings was as shown in Table 1.
Table 1: Responses on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD/SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am being paid</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>78(38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair amount for the</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>13(5.7)</td>
<td>25(12.4)</td>
<td>105(51.4)</td>
<td>58(28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who do well stand affair chance of being promoted</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>14(6.7)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>97(47.6)</td>
<td>69(34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the benefits I receive</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>78(38.1)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his /her job</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>14(6.7)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>97(47.6)</td>
<td>69(34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the people I with</td>
<td>12(5.7)</td>
<td>21(10.5)</td>
<td>2(1.0)</td>
<td>93(45.7)</td>
<td>76(37.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand exactly what I am supposed to do</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>12(5.7)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>100(44.1)</td>
<td>78(38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always finish my work successfully</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>14(6.7)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>97(47.6)</td>
<td>69(34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work assignments are fully explained and easy to understand</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>77(38.1)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings, 48.6% agreed that they were being paid the right amount for the work they do, 51.4% agreed that those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted. 47.6% of the respondents were satisfied with the benefits they receive in their workplace. 48.6% strongly agreed that their supervisors are quite competent in doing their job, 34.3% strongly agreed that they like the people they work with. Study findings also show that 45.7% of the respondents agreed that they understand what they are supposed to do in their work stations, 44.8% agreed that they always finish their work successfully, and 47.6% agreed that their work assignments are fully explained and easy to understand.

Effect of Working Environment on Employee Turnover
The study used the parameters where: The study used the parameters where: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). 2= Disagree (D 3 = Sometimes agree / Sometimes disagree (SA/SD) 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA), A summary of the findings is as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Responses on Work Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Environment</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD/SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My work demands are provided by Management</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>77(38.1)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety regulations are provided</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>19(9.5)</td>
<td>27(13.3)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>55(26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am exposed to</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>65(32.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to study findings in Table 2, 48.6% of the respondents with a mean of 4.17 and standard deviation of 0.871 strongly agreed that their work demands are provided by the management. They also agreed (41.6%) that safety regulations were provided in the work place and were exposed to work harassment.

The respondents agreed (45.7%) agreed that team cohesion is practiced at the work place, while 45.7% of the employees neutrally agreed that they were motivated with management style of leadership. They (47.6%) also agreed that management prioritized actions and 48.6% agreed that they were satisfied with their job. They also disagreed (48.6%) that their work had no job security.

**Effect of Supervisory Support on Employee Turnover**

The study used the parameters where: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). 2= Disagree (D 3 = Sometimes agree / Sometimes disagree (SA/SD) 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA), and summary of the findings was as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Responses on Supervisory Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD/SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor talks strongly</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>65(32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on what needs to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication takes form of</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>20(9.6)</td>
<td>91(44.7)</td>
<td>69(34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orders of top- bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor goes beyond</td>
<td>12(5.7)</td>
<td>23(11.4)</td>
<td>2(1.0)</td>
<td>91(44.8)</td>
<td>76(37.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive communication</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>77(38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management before outsiders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before outsiders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor consults me</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>65(32.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before he makes decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor acts in ways</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>19(9.5)</td>
<td>27(13.3)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>55(32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that builds my respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors re examines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to study findings in Table 3., 48.6% of the respondents with a mean of 4.11 and standard deviation of 1.165 agreed that their supervisors talks strongly on what needs to be done; 44.7% of the respondents agreed that communication in the institutions took the form of clear orders from top to bottom. They also agreed (44.8%) that their supervisors went beyond self-interest of good of the group, while 48.6% agreed that they received communication from organization about management actions before I hear the information in news or from outsiders. Respondents (48.6%) agreed that their supervisors consulted them before making decisions pertaining their job and acts in ways that builds their respect.

**Table 4: Responses on Work flexibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SA/SD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have the freedom to change My work shift Schedule</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>93(45.7)</td>
<td>69(34.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can easily switch shifts with My colleagues</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>8(3.8)</td>
<td>16(7.6)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>77(38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can change my start and finish time for shifts</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>19(9.5)</td>
<td>27(13.3)</td>
<td>99(48.6)</td>
<td>55(26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the freedom to choose When I can work comfortably Management is supportive When I have a work problem I feel comfortable bringing up Personal or family issues with My Manager My manager really cares about the effects that work demands</td>
<td>6(2.9)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>18(8.6)</td>
<td>93(45.7)</td>
<td>69(34.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents (45.7%) agreed that their supervisors re-examined critical assumptions to questions on whether they were okay while 38.3% of the respondents agreed that their supervisors spends time in teaching and coaching.

**Effect of Work Flexibility on Employee Turnover**

The study used the parameters where: The study used the parameters where: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). 2= Disagree (D 3 = Sometimes agreed / Sometimes (SA/SD) 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA), and summary of the findings is as shown in Table 4.
have on my personal and family
My manager understands when
I talk about personal or family
Issues that affect my work

According to study findings in Table 3, 45.7% of the respondents with a mean of 4.45 and standard deviation of 0.554 agreed that they have freedom to change their work shift schedule; 48.6% of the respondents agreed that they can easily switch shifts with their colleagues and they can start and finish time for shifts. They also agreed (45.7%) that they had the freedom to choose when they can work comfortably and management is supportive when they have work related problem. Respondents (44.8%) agreed that they felt comfortable bringing up personal or family issues with their manager since their managers cares about the effects that work demands have on my personal and family life. The respondents (47.6%) agreed that their managers understood when they talk about personal or family issues that affect their work.

**Employee Turnover Respondent’s Rate**
The study used the parameters where: The study used the parameters where: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). 2= Disagree (D 3 = Sometimes agree/ Sometimes disagree (SA/SD) 4=Agree (A), 5=Strongly Agree (SA), A summary of the findings was as shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Responses on Employee Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will leave my job as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot about leaving this university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am keenly searching for an alternative an organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think I will spend my entire career with this University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a new job in the next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently consider working else where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the next few years I will leave this company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to look for a new job unrelated to Public Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to study findings in Table 5, 36.3% of the respondents strongly agree they can leave their job as soon as possible, 39.2% strongly agreed that they always thought a lot about leaving their university, 34.8% agreed that they were keenly searching for alternatives in other organization. They also agreed to they don’t think they would spend their entire career in the university as depicted by a mean of 4.17 and standard deviation 0.871. 35.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that they would probably look for another new job next year.

They also agreed (39.7%) that they frequently consider working elsewhere, (39.2%) that in the next few years they would leave the institution, and (27.9%) agreed that they were planning to look for a new job unrelated to the public sector.

**Correlation Analysis between Study Variables and Employee Turnover**

The findings indicated that there was weak positive and significant relationship between work environments to employee turnover in the University. This was depicted by a Pearson correlation coefficient $r=0.917$, $p$-value $=0.000 < 0.05$ which was significant at 0.05 level of significance.

This implied there was an association between work environment and employee turnover. There was strong positive and significant relationship between supervisor support and employee turnover with a Pearson correlation coefficient $r=0.887$, $p$-value $=0.000 <0.01$ which was significant at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that increased supervisor support results in an increase of employee turnover.

### Table 6: Multiple Correlations Analysis of the Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Work environment</th>
<th>Supervisor support</th>
<th>Work flexibility</th>
<th>Employee turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.917**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.867**</td>
<td>.887**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work environment</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>.887**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.916**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.887**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor support</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>.916**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.915**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.950**</td>
<td>.931**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work flexibility</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.944**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee turnover</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The results also indicated that there was strong positive and significant relationship between work flexibility and Employee turnover in selected public universities in Kenya. This was depicted by a Pearson correlation coefficient $r=0.898$, $p$-value $=0.002 < 0.05$ which was significant at 0.05 level of significance. This implied that improved work flexibility results in an increase in Employee turnover.
Multiple Linear Regression for all the Variables

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance the ANOVA test indicated that in this model the independent variable is significant indicator of employee turnover.

Table 7: ANOVA Table on Employee Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>1645.607</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>411.402</td>
<td>570.545</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>72.107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1717.714</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job satisfaction, work environment, work flexibility, supervisor support
b. Dependent Variable: employee turnover

From the findings; at 5% level of significance, job satisfaction was a significant predictor of Employee turnover at selected public universities in Kenya where (p=0.008 <0.05), Work environment was a significant predictor of Employee turnover where (p=0.000<0.05), Work flexibility was a significant predictor of employee output as depicted by (p=0.000<0.05), and supervisor support was a significant predictor of Employee turnover as depicted by (p=0.000<0.05).

Table 8: Coefficients Analysis of the Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>2.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>7.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work flexibility</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>6.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>4.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: employee turnover

Letting $Y$ be employee turnover, $\hat{X}_1$ be job satisfaction, $\hat{X}_2$ be work environment, $\hat{X}_3$ be work flexibility, and $\hat{X}_4$ be supervisor support, using the regression coefficients in Table 4., we have;

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{X}_1 + \beta_2 \hat{X}_2 + \beta_3 \hat{X}_3 + \beta_4 \hat{X}_4$$

$$Y = 1.272 + 0.024 \times \hat{X}_1 + 0.477 \times \hat{X}_2 + 0.294 \times \hat{X}_3 + 0.258 \times \hat{X}_4$$

From the equation above when job satisfaction is increased by one unit Employee turnover will increase by 0.024, a unit increase in work environment will result to 0.477 increase in Employee turnover, a unit increase in work flexibility will result to 0.294 increase in Employee turnover, and a unit increase supervisor support will result to 0.25

DISCUSSION

The Effect Of Job Satisfaction On Employee Turnover In The Selected Kenyan Public Universities

The results showed that in the model summary that value $R^2$ square was 0.0837 which indicated that the variation of employee turnover in the selected public
was explained by Job satisfaction. Anova Table predicted that job satisfaction was an important predictor of employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities with the significance value of 0.000 which was less than 0.05 level of significance \((p=0.00< 0.05)\). The results showed that job satisfaction had a significant influence on employee turnover in selected public universities in Kenya \((t\ statistic=23.009, \ p\-value=0.000< 0.05)\). Finally, 5% level of significance rejected the null hypothesis by indicating that job satisfaction had a positive relationship with employee turnover in selected public universities in Kenya.

**The Effects of Working Environment on Employee Turnover in the Selected Kenyan Public Universities**

Results showed the variation of R- 0.903 which was 90.3 % was explained by the work environment. Anova test indicated that the independent variable of work environment in the model was 0.000 which was less than 0.05 the significance level. The results showed that the t-test of statistics indicated 30.97 which 5% level of significance which rejects the null hypotheses and indicates work environment has a positive effect on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.

**The Effects of Supervisory Support on Employee Turnover in the Selected Kenyan Public Universities**

Results showed that the value of R-Square was 0.890 or 89% variation of employee turnover explained by the independent variable of Supervisory Support. The results of ANOVA showed that supervisory support predicted employee turnover with significance value of 0.000 which was less than 0.05 level of significance \((p=0.00< 0.05)\). Results showed that coefficient results which revealed that Supervisory support had a significant relationship on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities with a t- statistic of 28.910, \((p=\text{value} -0.000<0.05)\). Therefore 5 % significance level rejected the null hypothesis by indicating that supervisory support had a positive relationship with employee turnover in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.

**The Effects of Work Flexibility on Employee Turnover in the Selected Kenyan Public Universities**

Results showed that the value of R-Square was 0.866. This suggested that, 86.6% of variation of Employee turnover was clarified by work flexibility of the employees. The findings showed that 0.05 level of significance the ANOVA test indicated that the independent variable of work flexibility in model mostly it predicts of employee turnover in the selected public universities as indicated by significance value=0.000 which is less than 0.05 level of significance \((p=0.000<0.05)\).

The study revealed that work flexibility was a significant determinant on employee turnover in selected public universities in Kenya with \((\text{statistic}= 25.933, \ p\-value=0.000< 0.05)\). Therefore at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that work flexibility had a positive relationship that can determine employee turnover in selected public universities in Kenya. Likewise for every unit increase in work flexibility there was a corresponding increase in employee turnover by 0.803.

**The Effect of Employee Turnover on Employee**

Most respondents (39.7%) agreed that they frequently consider working elsewhere, which was the highest in percentage. This was depicted by a Pearson correlation coefficient \(r=0.898, \ p\-value =0.002 < 0.05\) which was significant at 0.05 level of significance. The results also indicated that there was strong positive and significant relationship between work flexibility and Employee turnover in selected public universities in Kenya. This was depicted by a Pearson correlation coefficient \(r=0.898, \ p\-value =0.002 < 0.05\) which was significant at 0.05 level of significance. The ANOVA analysis of
findings; at 5% level of significance all the variable were significant to employee turnover.

CONCLUSION

It was concluded that job satisfaction has effect on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan public universities. Job satisfaction predicts employee turnover. When workers are satisfied with their job they are likely not to leave (Nishinde, 2015). Employees may be satisfied or dissatisfied with their job in a work setting. Employees will be satisfied and consider staying when the recompense is equal to their output (Armstrong, 2012).

Work environment has an effect on employee turnover in the selected Kenyan public universities. From the study findings the work environment is a predictor of employee turnover. For every increase there was on work environment there was an increase in turnover. When employees are provided with safety gears have no work harassment then the relationship at work is improves and turnover reduces.

From the findings also the supervisory support has an effect when employees are respected at the work place, receive communication in good and when decisions are made in consultation the relationship improves turnover. When supervisory support is low in organization turnover becomes significant (Rothmann, 2011). Employees need to be encouraged so that they can feel fit to work.

The work flexibility effect has a positive relationship on employee turnover , when employee have the freedom of choosing when to work, their personal problems also being listen to this increases their work output and improve service delivery which will reduce costs.

Finally, the objective of the study was to find out the determinants employee turnover among employee in the selected Kenyan Public Universities. At the end of the discussion, it is concluded from research that job satisfaction, work environment, supervisory support and work flexibility have a positive determinants on employee turnover among employees in the selected Kenyan Public Universities.

The study used the model of spillover – cross over model was used in the study that explained the relationship between work flexibility and employee turnover in public universities. The model was tested using one hypotheses and data from 204 respondent. Results showed that work flexibility has strong effect on employee turnover, which means that theories of the study of equity theory and expectancy theory were also used to test the hypothesis of H$_0^1$, H$_0^2$ and H$_0^3$, theories had effect in the study.

Equity theory (Adams,1983) clarifies that when employees do not receive the equal benefits according to their work performance then the job satisfaction is affected , when employees receive equally what they work for like other similar employees whether internal or external they will be satisfied and this increase productivity and reduce turnover of exit. The expectancy theory Expectancy theory (1961) proves that when an employee receives all that is required as recompense at the place of work he/ him will be motivated and stay.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Management in the selected Kenyan Public universities should implement job satisfaction at the work place since it has a positive effect on employee turnover. Management should put in place attractive human resources practices that will reduce employee turnover and avoid costs. Job satisfaction should be implemented on the importance on and significance of reducing costs and creating employee motivation towards turnover. When employees receive satisfied recompense then dissatisfaction will be reduced and employee will opt to stay.

Work environment should be enhanced in the selected Kenyan public universities to increase the work relationships at workplace. Workers should
have a safe work environment that encourages good work relationship. A worker needs to have a psychological environment that motivates them in their job. They need policies that cover them from work harassment to increase their belonging in the Universities.

University management needs to consider having a strong supervisory support with the Kenyan selected public universities. The supervisory support creates good relationship by listen to employees, creating team cohesion and problem solving and this will encourage employees to open up when they have difficulties and increase their work productivity and reduce accidents costs with the management.

With the current new technology employees would prefer to work from wherever they are to avoid problems between their families and individual career. The management should implement the work flexibility in their working styles so that staff can work without affecting their personal needs by coming up with shifts, tele-working among others. This will save time costs for both the employee and employer in decision making.

Suggestions for Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, the following suggestions were made for further research; The variables used to measure employee turnover includes; job satisfaction, work environment, supervisory support along their dimensions may not be extensive. A further research review of employee turnover with different dimensions of job satisfaction on employee turnover

This study yield more result on work flexibility as a variable but future research may be done using the same variable with same dimensions but in Kenyan public Health institutions. A similar research can be reviewed using the variables of organization policies, organization commitment, and employee commitment on employee turnover in Kenyan public university. Further research could be done from Central region and Cost region where they seem to be more advanced in technology and infrastructures.
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