

Fresh Graduates' Retention: A Review of Literature

Carole Serhan¹, Haritini Tsangari¹, Dolores Sanchez Bengoa², Selim Mekdessi³

¹(School of Business, University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus)

²(University of Applied Management Studies, Mannheim, Germany, International Business School, Vilnius University, Lithuania)

³(Doctoral School of Law, Political, Administrative and Economic Sciences, Lebanese University, Beirut, Lebanon)

Abstract: *The age of automation and globalization has facilitated the exchange of information among the new generations all over the world. Fresh graduates, as a part of this modernized and digitalized world, are deeply affected. Knowing that most of them are suffering from a complexity of work integration and a lack of motivation and satisfaction, they are profiting from these facilities to find jobs abroad. Thus, retaining fresh graduates, being one of the most difficult challenges facing organizations nowadays, has quickly turned out to be a priority for employers. Knowing the importance of this subject of study, the present study tries to review the various available literature and research work on fresh graduates' retention and the factors affecting their retention and job satisfaction.*

Keyword: *Fresh graduates, retention, job satisfaction, motivation, literature*

I. Introduction

Fresh graduates' retention in the workplace is a new issue attracting researchers worldwide especially that economic growth is not creating a sufficient number of qualified jobs as fresh graduates' numbers increase all over the world (Cleveland et al., 2013 [1]; Menon et al., 2012 [2]; Tektas et al., 2010 [3]). In most countries, fresh graduates suffer from economic crisis and feel as being weakly integrated in the society. They suffer from a difficulty to find a job, a complexity of work integration and a difficulty of securing a place to reside. The living costs are very high if to be compared to fresh graduates' wages (Mroueh, 2012) [4]. Besides, employers show a clear uncertainty to hire fresh graduates without full time experience knowing that it will cost them time and money to train inexperienced ones. In brief, these barriers make it tough for employers to retain fresh graduates. Discussing this issue from its broad image, one can notice that fresh graduates all over the world face various challenges and these challenges can be divided into broad areas of discussions of which expectations and competencies constitutes a major part. Concerning fresh graduates' expectations, Cleveland et.al. (2013) [1] stated that after studying for a long time, new graduates expect a lot from the job they suppose it should be the reward for all this long time spent in studying. Their expectation levels are relatively high in comparison to the satisfaction levels which are low (Tektas et al., 2010) [3]. Besides, fresh graduates proved that they are notoriously disloyal and, unlike earlier generations, will happily move between jobs until their expectations are met which makes it harder for employers to retain them (Jackson and Chapman, 2012) [5]. Concerning fresh graduates' competencies, many employers argue that nowadays, fresh graduates lack three major qualifications: critical thinking, initiative and effective communication skills (Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, 2012 [6]). Ulrich (2003) [7] stated that the most essential key factors to successfully move new graduates through the transition into the job life is the orientation and the internships development which should explore competencies. With all these challenges around, fresh graduates are being more and more obliged to accept job offers designed for non degree holders. Employers from different industries realized that the acquired university level doesn't match the required competencies for the job. For this, many universities all over the world have been trying to design new education systems which take into consideration the required skills and necessary competencies like language and communication, working in multi-cultural environments and decision making (Chiru et al., 2012 [8]; Agenor et al., 2007 [9]; Coll and Zegwaard, 2006 [10]) for fresh graduates to meet the expectations of employers. Considering the importance of this issue and the limited information available concerning fresh graduates in general, the purpose of the present work which is to review the various available literature and research work on fresh graduates' retention and the factors affecting their retention and job satisfaction should be of a great value to employers allowing them to maximize the sustenance of their fresh graduates in a challenging local Labor market.

II. Objectives Of The Study

This study on review of literature concerning fresh graduates' retention initiatives undertakes the following objectives:

1. To examine the existing literature in relation to the theories on fresh graduates' retention.
2. To critically review the literature on the relation between job satisfaction and retention.
3. To explore the existing literature on the various factors that influence fresh graduates' retention.
4. To identify theoretical gaps in existing literature.

III. Theories Related To Retention

Motivation, satisfaction, involvement and retention, being interrelated, have been the subject of many studies and approaches all over the world. In order to make fresh graduates satisfied and committed to their jobs, there is a need for a strong and effective motivation at various levels (Shujaat et al., 2014) [11]. Motivation and job satisfaction are often used interchangeably. Job satisfaction refers to the happiness or comfort that a job gives an individual while motivation refers only to the reasons an individual achieves a job, regardless of whether the job brings him happiness (Parvin and Nurul Kabir, 2011) [12]. For a better understanding of these two terms, in order to incorporate them in the study of fresh graduates' retention, it is important to explain the theories which have examined their interrelationship and their role as predictors of retention. These theories are mainly classified into need based theories, cognitive process based theories, behavioral theories and the job characteristics theory.

3.1 Need Based Theories

Need based theories are those theories founded on the idea that motivation comes up from the individual's desire to satisfy a need. Unsatisfied needs are the stimulators that motivate individuals (Jex and Britt, 2008) [13]. Four theories may be placed under this category: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Motivation Hygiene Theory, ERG Theory and McClelland Theory of Needs.

3.1.1 Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1954) [14] is a theory for human motivation that was suggested by Abraham Maslow in 1943. This theory proposes that people have needs and motivation lies in the process of satisfying these needs. Maslow arranged needs in a way that lower level or more basic needs are to be satisfied before higher level needs and created what he called a hierarchy of needs, which focused on five categories of needs that were classified in an upward order of importance. Suggested lower level needs are: physiological needs, safety needs, and social needs. Physiological needs refer to air, water, food and sleep, which are considered as basic needs. If these needs are not satisfied then individuals will feel motivated for the mission to satisfy them. And according to Maslow, individuals will not seek higher needs unless they satisfy these needs first. Safety needs refer to living in a safe place and enjoying medical services, job security and financial reserves while social needs refer to the need for friends, for belonging and love. Suggested higher level needs are: esteem and self-actualization. Esteem refers to self-respect, confidence, achievement, recognition and others. Self-actualization refers to needs such as truth, justice, wisdom and it is important to mention that according to Maslow this need is never fully satisfied and only few people reaches this level of very high satisfaction. Thus in brief, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs assumes that a satisfied need can no longer be a motivator and at this stage only the next level of needs will become the new motivator and the attention will be driven to this next level in the hierarchy. Critiques to Maslow's Hierarchy were many. Whaba and Bridwell (1976) [15] in their review of this theory asserted that there was no definite evidence that human needs are divided into five categories and that these categories are placed in the right hierarchy. Cianci and Gambrel (2003) [16] stated that cultures place the social needs before any other ones. Hoftside (1984) [17] declared that there is no clear evidence that individuals tend to satisfy one need at a time and Kenrick et al. criticized the placement of sex in the basic physiological needs (Kernick, 2010 [18]; Kernick et al., 2010 [19]).

3.1.2 Motivation Hygiene Theory

Motivation Hygiene Theory (also called Two Factor Theory, Dual Theory or Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory) was developed by Frederic Herzberg in 1959. According to Herzberg (Herzberg et al., 1959) [20], job satisfaction act in a different way than job dissatisfaction meaning that factors that cause job satisfaction are quite different from factors that cause job dissatisfaction. The job characteristics, which are related to the job, nature sound to be able to satisfy the needs of achievement, personal worth and self realization and by this create a feeling of happiness and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the absence of these needs doesn't create a feeling of dissatisfaction because this latter is related to different factors such as organization's policy, salary, interpersonal relations, working conditions and others (Herzberg, 1964) [21]. Herzberg divided job characteristics into two different types: the motivators and the hygiene factors (Herzberg et al., 1959) [20]. The motivators refer to the intrinsic job characteristics that he believes are the reason behind a positive satisfaction such as recognition, achievement or personal growth while the hygiene factors refer to the extrinsic job characteristics that he believes doesn't create a feeling of positive satisfaction but prevents job dissatisfaction.

At the end, it is important to mention that the motivator factors of Herzberg correspond to the higher level needs of Maslow (Herzberg, 1966) [22]. Critiques to the Two Factor Theory were many especially those concerning the choice of the respondents and the form of the research itself. Holloway (1996) [23] in his research to examine this theory concluded that Herzberg didn't include the office and production workers because they simply didn't give him the results he was expecting and focused on accountants and engineers instead. As well, Goldthorpe (1969) [24] shared Holloway same point of view adding that a perfect model should be able to distinguish between the different types of workers and their corresponding different needs and expectations. Others criticized the differentiation between the satisfaction and dissatisfaction factors and considered this nonsense (King, 1970) [25].

3.1.3 ERG Theory

ERG theory was developed by Clayton Alderfer in 1969 where E stands for Existence, R stands for Relatedness and G stands for Growth (Aldefer, 1969) [26]. Clayton, in his work, redefined the Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory by classifying needs into three categories: Existence needs, Relatedness needs and Growth needs. Existence needs correspond to the basic and safety needs of Maslow's hierarchy, the Relatedness needs correspond to Maslow's social and self esteem needs while the Growth needs correspond to Maslow's self actualization needs and personal development desires (Aldefer, 1972) [27]. Unlike Maslow, ERG theory allows an individual to seek multiple needs at a time and the order of needs might vary from one individual to another. Furthermore it recognizes that when an individual is unable to satisfy a high level need, he will increase his desire for lower needs. For example if an individual is unable to satisfy his growth needs, he will increase his desire for relatedness needs and socialize more with coworkers or he will increase his desire for rewards. Critiques to this theory revealed the difficulty to obtain the information about what motivates the person to act in a certain way and then to discover what is the most important need for the person since ERG theory allows individuals to satisfy any of the needs at the same time (Hunter et al., 1990) [28].

3.1.4 McClelland's Theory of Needs

McClelland's Theory of Needs (also called the Three Needs Theory, the Acquired-Needs Theory or the Learned Needs Theory) was developed by David McClelland in 1961. In his theory, McClelland (1975) [29] focused on three needs: the need for achievement, the need for power and the need for affiliation. The need for achievement refers to the need to outshine, to achieve and to make every effort to be successful. Individuals who have a need for achievement prefer to succeed in their jobs. They choose the tasks of reasonable difficulty and look for personal achievements instead of financial rewards. They look for finding solutions to problems and receiving feedback for their performance so they can evaluate their achievements. They need to feel that their success or failure is due to their own efforts (McClelland, 1975 [29]; McClelland and Burnham, 1976 [30]). The need for power refers to need to influence, to teach, and to control others. Individuals who have a need for power prefer to work in a group where there is competitiveness, where there are possibilities for convincing and influencing others and especially for gaining prestige much more than performing effectively. The need for affiliation refers to the need for spending more time with others, for maintaining social relationships and for being loved and accepted by others. Individuals who enjoy high affiliation needs look for friendship and prefer co-operation instead of competitiveness. Critiques to this theory reveal that it is not applicable in the public sector where employees are motivated mostly by job security, stability and teamwork rather than prestige and authority. Thus they have high affiliation needs and low achievement and power needs which will make it difficult for managers to assign tasks and create competitive environments (Jurkiewicz et al., 1998) [31].

3.2 Cognitive Process Theories

Cognitive Process Theories are those theories that study the "process" of motivation and are interested mainly in knowing how motivation takes place (Mohr, 1982) [32]. Four theories can be placed under this category: Vroom's Expectancy Theory, Adam's Equity Theory, Goal Setting Theory and Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory.

3.2.1 Vroom's Expectancy Theory

Vroom's Expectancy Theory was first developed by Victor Vroom in 1964. In his theory, Vroom (1964 [33], 1982 [34]) didn't follow Maslow, Alderfer, Herzberg and McClelland need theories which tried to examine what motivates people. Instead, he assumed that individuals are not only motivated by their needs but also make work related decisions concerning what they intend to do or not to do. These decisions are based on the expected abilities to achieve tasks and receive rewards. So this theory highlights the importance of relating rewards directly to performance and of making sure that these rewards are those expected by the employees. In addition, Vroom suggested a couple of cognitive variables that reveal differences in work motivation. These variables are: Expectancy, Instrumentality and Valence. Expectancy refers to the individual's expectations and

confidence levels about what he is able to perform. Instrumentality refers to the level of trust an individual has that he will receive an appropriate reward if the task is achieved successfully while Valence refers to the value an individual assigns to his expected rewards. These three variables form a multiplicative model. Thus, all the three variables must be high in order to enjoy a high probability of motivated performance. Critiques to this theory were mostly based on the simplicity of this multiplicative model. Lawler (1973) [35] described this simplicity as deceptive and Maloney and McFillen (1985 [36], 1986 [37]) considered Vroom's theory as applicable for the construction industry employees only.

3.2.2 Adam's Equity Theory

Adam's Equity Theory was first developed by John Stacey Adams in 1963. Adam (1963 [38], 1965 [39]) in his theory proposes that an employee compares his own outcome input ratio to the outcome input ratio of other employees called referents and whom he considers similar to himself. It is important to mention that outcome refers to salaries, benefits, recognition, job security, opportunities for advancement and others while input refers to skill level, education, training, work experience and others. Outcome input ratio refers to how much in percentage is the outcome received from a job out of the input put in this same job. Equal ratios create job satisfaction and motivate employees to maintain this equity or to increase their input if they want their output to increase while unequal ones end up with job dissatisfaction and motivate employees to bring back equity. Critiques to this theory concerned the hypothesis and the application of this theory. Huseman et al (1987) [40] proposed questions about the applicability of this theory in real life situation and questioned the simplicity of the model stressing on the importance of various missing variables that affect individual's perceptions of equity such as demographic and psychological variables.

3.2.3 Goal Setting Theory

Goal Setting Theory was developed by Edwin Locke in the mid 1960s. The theory proposes an inductive correlation between goal setting and enhanced production performance (Locke, 1968) [41] where goal is defined as the objective of a task that an individual seeks to perform and achieve (Locke and Latham, 2002 [42], 2006 [43]). It further proposes that the intentions to achieve a goal are the main reason behind work motivation. Goals which are specific and which are judged difficult to perform are likely to increase performance more than other goals. The enhanced production performance is deemed to be affected by goal setting in four ways: Choice, Effort, Persistence and Cognition. Choice means that goals focus attention towards the activities which are more relevant to the goal than others. Effort means that goals demand effort and the higher the goal the more the effort needed. Persistence means that goals affect perseverance so an individual needs to work hard in order to reach his goal. Finally, Cognition means that goals help individuals to deal with the situation they are facing. In his model, Locke added four conditions to make a goal effective in increasing motivation. These conditions are: goal acceptance, goal specificity, goal difficulty and goal feedback. Goal acceptance refers to the idea that for a goal to be motivating to an individual, it must be first accepted by this individual. Goal specificity refers to the idea that the more specific the goal the higher the performance. Goal difficulty refers to the idea that the more difficult the goal setting, the higher the motivation and the commitment and goal feedback refers to the idea that feedback is a necessity for goals to stay effective and to maintain commitment. It is important to mention that self made feedback is proved to be powerful than feedback from external sources such as supervisors and that employees who have the chance to set their own goals, their efforts will be superior to those related to goals consigned by others. Critiques to this theory were that managers' goals may not support the organization's goals and if this is the case a direct conflict will arise. As a result of this conflict, performance will suffer. Furthermore, if tasks are very difficult to perform, individuals will be more concerned in meeting their goals rather than achieving their tasks (Schweitzer et al., 2004) [44].

3.2.4 Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory

Social Cognitive Theory was first proposed in 1941 by Miller and Dollard as a social learning theory. In 1986, Bandura and Walters extended this theory and since then it is known as Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1989) [45]. This theory proposes that performance is a function of ability and motivation. It assumes that innovative work behavior influences task performance and that innovative self-efficiency and outcome expectations in turn affect innovative work behavior. This theory emphasizes the complex ways in which people, their behaviors and environments mutually influence one another and is mainly used to understand the career puzzle and to promote career success (Bandura, 1989 [45]). Bandura's theory was criticized for its ignorance to biological states. It ignored the fact that some behaviors in life are partially hereditary and not only acquired (Hart et al., 2006) [46].

3.3 Behavioral Theories

Behavioral theories of motivation are those theories which consider that two factors are believed to be essential for motivation: rewards and incentives. The reward is the consequence of a particular form of behavior while the incentive encourages or discourages the behavior. The most used behavioral theory is the behavioral learning theory which is mostly applied in the teaching field and especially to students. This theory proposes that behavior changes can confirm that learning took place (Rousseau, 1995) [47]. Critiques to behavioral theories of motivation argue that incentives may reduce intrinsic motivation and cause students to focus on incentives instead of learning and that incentives can be effective however if they are based on the quality of the work (Rousseau, 1995) [47].

3.4 Job Characteristics Theory

Hackman and Oldham Job Characteristics Theory focuses on the relationship among three main parts: the psychological states of employees, the job characteristics that affect these states and the individuals' attributes that determine how positively a person can respond to a complex and challenging job (Hackman and Oldham, 1975 [48], 1976 [49], 1980[50]). The job characteristics are seen as affecting three psychological states that, in turn, lead to many valuable personal and work outcomes. The theory suggests that employees who experience high levels of the psychological states (experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work and knowledge of the actual results of the work activities) are likely to feel good about themselves and respond positively to their job (Hackman and Oldham, 1976 [49], 1980 [50]). Moreover, it proposes that these states can be seen as influenced by five core job characteristics (skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy and feedback from job). In particular, skill variety, task identity and task significance, joined together, are seen to form the experienced meaningfulness of the work. This can be explained by the fact that workers consider their jobs as worthwhile and meaningful when these jobs require the use of several different skills, allow them to complete a substantial piece of work (as opposed to the continuous repetition of a simple task) and have an impact on other people. Job autonomy is seen as influencing experienced responsibility for the outcomes of the work and feedback is seen as influencing knowledge of the actual results of the work activities (Rungtusanatham and Anderson, 1996) [51]. The three psychological states, all together, are seen as a determinant of the following different personal and work outcomes: high internal work motivation, high "growth" satisfaction, high general job satisfaction and high work effectiveness. However, through examining this theory, one can notice that the three psychological states can be purely considered as intrinsic or internal to the job itself. Thus, this theory focuses only on intrinsic motivation and doesn't emphasize on the importance of extrinsic motivation. Besides it doesn't take into consideration various job dimensions that have been found to have an effect on worker satisfaction and motivation, such as social relationships (e.g., ERG Theory or McClelland's Theory of Needs) and participation in the setting of goals and work load (e.g., Goal Setting Theory) (Serhan and Tsangari, 2015) [52].

IV. Job Satisfaction And Retention

Research worldwide has emphasized the interrelationship between fresh graduates' retention and job satisfaction. However, although job satisfaction is widely used in research studies, literature has not agreed on one single definition and contradictory evidence exists regarding its relation with retention. In the past, retaining employees was affected by two dimensions: the accomplishment of a good job by the employee and the capacity of the employer to pay him for this job. However, today, employees' loyalty decreased and alternative opportunities increased. Thus, retention has quickly turned out to be a priority for employers. Aguenza and Som (2012) [53] considered retention as being the process of retaining employees in an organization. According to him, retention is a basic reason behind the success of an organization and is affected by various motivational factors. In order to understand the retention of employees, Mitchell et al. (2001) [54] examined the importance of the community in retaining employees. The more employees participate in community life the more they establish relationships and connections in and out of their job which makes leaving a job a hard matter since it requires rearranging these connections. Meyer and Allen (1991) [55] described employee retention as being employee commitment, loyalty and desire to work for achieving the organization's goals and objectives. Furthermore, they stated that employee retention is a psychological state that defines the relationship between the employee and the organization with the decision to remain in the same organization.

Concerning job satisfaction, Hoppock was one of the first to give a definition. He considered job satisfaction as any mixture of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that make an individual declare satisfaction with his job (Hoppock, 1935) [56]. According to him, despite the influence of many external factors on job satisfaction, this latter one remains an internal feeling. This makes job satisfaction as being a set of factors that lead to a feeling of satisfaction.

In his definition, Vroom highlighted the importance of the job the employee holds at work. Thus he considered job satisfaction as being individuals' affective orientation toward the tasks they are currently doing

(Vroom, 1964) [33]. As well, Smith et al. (1969) [57] explained job satisfaction as being the feeling an individual has for his or her job. Locke (1968) [41] considered Job satisfaction as being a pleasing and agreeable response that results from the assessment of one's own job know-how and achievements. Schultz (1982) [58] suggested that job satisfaction is the psychological feeling of individuals towards their jobs and Wexley and Yukl (1984) [59], in their definition, highlighted the importance of many personal and job characteristics factors that affect job satisfaction. Siegal and Lance (1987) [60] defined job satisfaction as being simply that affecting reaction which defines how much individuals like their jobs. Davis and Nestrom (1985) [61] presented job satisfaction as being a mixture of different feelings that one has for his or her job and as being the degree of how much one's expectations match with the real job conditions. Expectations are determined usually by one's needs, desires and experiences.

One of the most used definitions was suggested by Spector who stated that job satisfaction is related to how people consider their job and every aspect of it. It is related to how much people like or dislike their current job, which results in a feeling of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction in every work condition (Spector, 1997) [62]. Okoth (2003) [63] considers job satisfaction as a positive and encouraging feeling that comes from the assessment and the evaluation of people's job experiences. It is a mixture of happy feelings that results from good pay, job security, fair treatment and others. Gumato (2003) [64] viewed job satisfaction as being the degree to which individuals consider positively their jobs. The higher the correlation among individuals' expectations, jobs' current rewards and received ones, the bigger the job satisfaction. Statt (2004) [65] stated that job satisfaction is the degree of how much an individual is satisfied with the rewards he or she is getting from his or her job. Mullins (2005) [66], in his definition differentiated between satisfaction and motivation and considered job satisfaction as being a many-sided approach, which has various meanings to various individuals and can be linked to different feelings such as accomplishment. Armstrong (2006) [67] defined job satisfaction as being the positive and encouraging attitude one has for his or her job. Kaliski (2007) [68] described job satisfaction as being the feeling of achievement and happiness that one has toward his job. He linked this feeling to productivity and to personal wellbeing. Howard et al. (2007) [69] stated that some job characteristics are more probably the key factors behind the employee's will to stay within an organization which contradicts other opinions that state that employee satisfaction is the main factor associated with employee retention. George and Jones (2008) [70] pointed that job satisfaction is the combination of emotions and trust that individuals experience with not only their present job but with every aspect of it such as the work category, the relation with coworkers and supervisors and the financial rewards.

V. Factors Affecting Fresh Graduates' Retention

Notwithstanding the above theories and definitions concerning job satisfaction and its relation to retention there is a significant body of literature showing the various and sometimes contradictory point of views concerning the relationship of various factors and retention. Despite these contradictions, the research studies devoted to tracing the linkages between these factors and job satisfaction and retention has grown significantly in recent years. Hackman and Oldham (1980) [50] mentioned that job characteristics are seen as affecting three psychological states that, in turn, lead to motivation and job satisfaction. Fritz-enz (1990) [71] discussed the existence of various factors which are the reasons behind retaining employees in an organization. Osteraker (1999) [72] and Walker (2001) [73] believed that retention factors can be divided into multiple dimensions which are mainly classified as social, mental and physical dimensions while Clarke (2001) [74] stressed the importance of human resource management factors in affecting retention. Pritchard (2007) [75] mentioned that training and development are major reasons behind retaining employees. Dochy et.al, (2009) [76] revealed that personal characteristics such as education level and others play a major role in the retention process. In order to better understand the dimensions of retention, a set of personal and job characteristics are considered. These characteristics are defined below with reference to job satisfaction, motivation, involvement and retention.

5.1 Personal Characteristics

In most job satisfaction studies (Khan et al., 2012 [77]; Shah, 2012 [78]; Rast and Tourani, 2012 [79]; Lai and Chen, 2012 [80]; Olorunsola, 2012 [81]), the most used personal characteristics are gender, education, marital status and age. These characteristics are often used to describe the respondents and to find relationships among the variables of the study. The relationship between personal characteristics and job satisfaction are positive in some studies and negative in others depending on the type of job, the geographical location and the level of expectation (Olorunsola, 2012 [81] and Lai and Chen 2012 [80]). This inconsistency in results is shown below in details.

5.1.1 Gender

Some research studies showed that men are the most satisfied (Donohue and Heywood, 2004) [82]; others showed that women are the most satisfied (Keith, et al., 2005 [83]; McDuff, 2001 [84]) while still others showed that there is no difference between men and women in regards to job satisfaction (Long, 2005 [85]; Ward and Sloane, 2000 [86]). The reasons behind the inconsistent results were described by Gruneberg (1979) [87] as follows: men and women at the same organization might hold different positions and might have different promotion prospects, pay and need satisfaction level.

5.1.2 Education

Carell and Elbert (1974) [88], in their study, concluded a negative relationship especially when talking of young jobholders with high level of education that becomes less satisfied when achieving routine jobs. Shah et al. (2012) [78] and DeSantis and Durst (1996) [89] declared a negative relationship between education and job satisfaction as well especially for the private sector employees while Tett et al. (2003) [90] recognized a positive relationship between employees' educational level and job satisfaction. Fresh graduates' expectations remain the main reason behind the inconsistency in results.

5.1.3 Marital Status

A review of marital status and job satisfaction studies shows inconsistent results as well. Khan (2012) [77], in his study, concluded that married teachers show more job satisfaction than their unmarried counterparts while Yoshikawa and Rasheed (2010) [91], in their study, concluded that married teachers in higher education show less job satisfaction.

5.1.4 Age

Herzberg et al. concluded in his study that at a young age satisfaction is high and then it decreases as age increases but later on and after hitting a low point it increases again (Holloway, 1996) [23]. However, Saleh and Otis (1964) [92] proposed almost the contrary and indicated, in their study, that there is a positive relationship between age and job satisfaction until the pre-retirement period during which job satisfaction decreases. On the other side, Spector (1997) [62] and Saner and Eyüpoğlu (2012) [93] concluded, in their study, that job satisfaction increases with age because employees move to better positions as they grew older, touch better benefits such as rewards or pay and tend to adjust their expectations to be more realistic which make them happy.

5.2 Job Characteristics

Over the last decades, many research studies around the world have been carried out to examine the impact of job characteristics and related psychological states on job satisfaction (Ahmed, 2012 [94]; Lee and Lee, 2012 [95]; Mokaya et al., 2013 [96]; Nurullah, 2010 [97]; Tourani and Rast 2012 [98]). Most research studies (Feyzi et al., 2012 [99]; Hsu and Chen 2012 [100]; Zagenczyk et al., 2010 [101]) conducted to study job satisfaction and retention has examined the role of some or all of the following job dimensions: participation, growth prospects, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, job security, authority, financial rewards, promotion, work load, physical effort, technology use, social environment of the job and feedback from the job as well as the role of some or all of the following related psychological states: self-esteem, accountability, feeling of accomplishment, prestige inside outside and commitment. These job characteristics and related psychological states are often considered as factors predicting job satisfaction and the relationship between the two showed to be significantly strong in most research studies regardless of the type of job itself. This relationship is better described below and helps to create a better understanding for the retention issue.

5.2.1 Participation

Employee Participation is the process in which influence is shared among employees who are otherwise hierarchically unequal (Wagner, 1994) [102]. All conducted research studies concerning the relationship between employee participation and job satisfaction showed positive results. Tourani and Rast (2012) [98] suggested that both employees' participation and communication have significant and positive effect on employees' job satisfaction. Muindi (2011) [103] examined the relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction among academic staff in public University of Nairobi and the findings showed a significantly strong positive correlation. Bhatti and Qureshi (2007) [104] conducted a study with thirty four organizations from different sectors and concluded that employee participation is a major determinant of job satisfaction.

5.2.2 Growth Prospects

Growth prospects refer to the various positions an employee expects to move to as he grows in an organization. This growth might be by moving vertically but also it might be by moving laterally or cross functionally to shift to a different type of job role. Meeting the growth prospects of employees has shown to be a major determinant of job satisfaction: Weng et al. (2012) [105], in their study conducted on new staff nurses, concluded that managers should improve the growth possibilities' models in order to enhance job satisfaction, Gruneberg (1979) [87] concluded as well that the more individuals' expectations and values are met the more the job satisfaction and Rast and Tourani (2012) [79] believe that job satisfaction is achieved for jobs which are found to be meeting employees' growth prospects.

5.2.3 Interpersonal Relationships

Interpersonal relationships refer to the elements that constitute the employee's social and support network in an organization. These might include the relationship with supervisors, the social relation with co-workers, and even the communications with clients or customers (Song and Olshfski, 2008) [106]. Research has demonstrated that positive interpersonal relationships at work have a great impact on job satisfaction (Zagenczyk et al., 2010 [101]). Thoms et al. (2012) [107] conducted a study to determine the relationship between cross-rational interpersonal relations and job satisfaction and they found that the most the effort an organization does in order to improve these relations, the most the job satisfaction. Furthermore, Mustapha and Zakaria (2012) [108], in their study conducted to determine the influence of interpersonal relationship on job satisfaction.

5.2.4 Working Conditions

The working condition is one of the major factors that influence job satisfaction (Mehmood et al., 2012 [109]; Sehgal, 2012 [110]). This includes the working hours, the Health insurance, the sick leave, the vacations and the workplace environment (e.g., humidity, temperature, lighting, air conditioning and seating). Many research studies have shown that the better the working environment, the more the job satisfaction (Shidhaye et al., 2011 [111]; Kinzl et al. (2005) [112]). However, Bakotić and Babić (2013) [113] declared that there is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction level between employees who work under difficult working conditions and those who work under normal working conditions. Concerning working hours, studies showed different results. In Denmark and Portugal, there's a positive relationship between working hours and job satisfaction meaning that people who work for long hours are more satisfied than those who work on a standard full time basis. This has been explained by the fact that the longer the working hours the highest the income. However, in France, Germany, Italy and Spain, there seems to be a positive relationship between working time flexibility and job satisfaction while a negative relationship is found regarding overtime work (Eurofound, 2012 [114]).

5.2.5 Job Security

Job security is the guarantee that has an employee about keeping his job. In a traditional work environment, employees are employed for a life time while today this life time job has been mostly replaced with a part time job and a short-term contract which have created a feeling of job insecurity, decreased the employee participation in decision making and reduced the degree of involvement and job satisfaction (Khaingna, 2006) [115]. Review of job security and job satisfaction studies indicates that the correlation between these two is significantly positive (Rast and Tourani, 2012 [79], Sehgal, 2012 [110]). This has been stated by Herzberg, in his "Two Factor Theory" as well.

5.2.6 Authority

Authority is nothing but giving power to an employee and it is a forceful source of job satisfaction. Another term of authority is empowerment which means that the organization is aware of the employee's ability and provides him with authority as a way to increase his job satisfaction (Bowen and Lawler, 1992) [116]. Many research studies (Malini and Pandian, 2013 [117]; Muindi, 2011 [103]) conducted to examine the relationship between authority and job satisfaction agreed that authority has a significant positive relation with job satisfaction.

5.2.7 Financial Rewards

Financial rewards refer to the package of payrolls, remunerations, salaries, benefits or compensations rewarded to employees. It has proved to have a strong and positive correlation with job satisfaction (Mokaya et al., 2013) [96]. Employees who feel that their remuneration package is fair compared to the level of responsibility are the most satisfied. Oshagbemi (2000) [118] and SHRM (2011) [119] concluded that there is a

statistically significant relationship between financial rewards and job satisfaction. Pay comparisons are also considered to be a part of job satisfaction factors (Card et al., 2012) [120].

5.2.8 Promotion

Promotions refer to rewards given for highly productive employees, creating an incentive to exert greater effort. They may be accompanied with wage, responsibilities and authority increases and most often it carries an increase in job amenities such as a bigger office (Dizgah et al., 2012 [121]; Ghaziani et al., 2012 [122]). Naveed et al. (2011) [123] concluded that there is a positive and significant correlation between promotion and job satisfaction and Kosteas (2010) [124] declared that not only employees who received promotions show higher satisfaction levels but also employees who are expecting to receive a promotion in the next two years report higher levels too.

5.2.9 Work Load

Many research studies (Hytter, 2008 [125]; Zeytinoglu and Denton, 2005 [126]) conducted to study the relationship between work load and different aspects such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and employment retention revealed the importance of work load in influencing employee retention. It is very important to recognize the emerging needs of employees to have a balanced work load required to create a feeling of commitment and satisfaction. Ramlall (2003) [127] declared that people try hard to stay in organizations that provide balanced work load. This creates a feeling of being valued and making difference.

5.2.10 Physical Effort

The physical effort is the use of physical energy to do an activity. Many researchers (Barr-Anderson et.al. 2011 [128]; Noorbakhsh and Ghambari, 2013 [129]) suggest that there is a relationship between physical effort and job satisfaction. Results showed that employees whose work requires physical energy show lower satisfaction levels than those who work in easier conditions.

5.2.11 Technology Use

Several authors (Limbu et.al., 2014 [130]; McMurtrey, 2002 [131]) who studied the relation between technology use and job satisfaction stated that technology use can positively influence job satisfaction and thus improve retention. Research discussed a statistically significant relationship between the combination technology use and job satisfaction. Attar and Sweis (2010) [132] stated that new technologies can result in employees working in a smarter way as well as becoming more productive and efficient. Rewards system needs to be rearranged to support the use of technology. Oldham and Hackman (2010) [133] recognized the importance of technological advances to help employees achieve an efficient coordination and a better team work and by this increase job satisfaction and retention.

5.2.12 Social Environment of the Job

Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) [134] studied the social environment effect on the satisfaction and retention of fresh graduates. Throughout their research, they stressed the importance of the following social environment factors as prime determinants of retention: Interdependence, feedback from others, social support, and interaction outside the organization. Grant and Parker (2009) [135] noticed that nowadays circumstances have changed and a great importance should be given to the social aspects of the work itself. Oldham and Hackman (2010) [133] focused on the importance of the social characteristics of the job and stated that these aforementioned factors as well as other social aspects of the work need to be identified and are definitely worthy of empirical investigation.

5.2.13 Feedback from Job

Perista and Carrilho (2012) [136] stated in their research that receiving constructive feedback proved to be an encouraging factor for most employees. It helps them to know where they are and how they can improve. Dugguh and Dennis (2014) [137]; Sommer and Kulkarni 2012 [138]) showed that fresh graduates respond to positive feedback while experts respond to negative feedback. This negative feedback should include what was wrong, why it was wrong and how it can be corrected. Besides, constructive feedback gives great opportunities for advancement within the organization and in turn creates better mood at work and greater job satisfaction. Studies in Portugal and different European countries (Judge et al., 2001 [139]) showed that feedback from supervisors had the most positive effect on worker's satisfaction. These studies emphasized the importance of training the management people on the best way to give feedback.

5.2.14 Self-Esteem

Self-Esteem is a psychological state that stands for the overall judgment that one places on oneself as a person (Rosenberg, 1965 [140]). It includes beliefs and emotions such as triumph, despair, pride and shame. Research studies concerning the relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction showed almost similar positive results. Korman (1970 [141], 2001 [142]), Nurullah (2010) [97] and Ahmed (2012) [94] found that self-esteem and valued job characteristics are direct and strongest predictors of job satisfaction among the emerging adults and explained that "individuals will tend to choose and find most satisfying those jobs which are consistent with their self-cognitions".

5.2.15 Accountability

Accountability, being the willingness to accept responsibility, has been proved to be a major determinant of job satisfaction (World Bank, 2005) [143]. Thoms et al. (2002) [107], Sorensen et al. (2009) [144] and Feyzi et al. (2012) [99] examined in their research studies the idea that employees' perceptions of their level of accountability are related to their job satisfaction. They concluded the existence of a significant correlation between the two.

5.2.16 Feeling of Accomplishment

The feeling of accomplishment refers to the sense of achieving something worthwhile. Research studies concerning the relationship between the feeling of accomplishment and job satisfaction showed almost similar positive results. Sehgal (2012) [110], Lee and Lee (2012) [95] and Hsu and Chen (2012) [100], in their studies concerning job satisfaction found a positive relationship between the feeling of accomplishment and job satisfaction.

5.2.17 Prestige Inside Outside

The prestige inside outside refers to the prestige of the job position inside and outside the organization. The prestige of the job inside the organization is an internal factor of motivation while the prestige outside the organization is an external factor. They both help to create a positive feeling toward the job and with other factors such as self-esteem and working conditions are considered to have a positive correlation with job satisfaction (Siegel, 1971 [145]; Treiman, 1977 [146]; Hodson, 1989[147])

5.2.18 Commitment

Commitment is the degree to which employees feel focused and enthusiastic about their work. The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), in their study, discussed that middle management and executive level employees are more committed to their work than lower level employees and are more determined to accomplish their organizations' goals (SHRM, 2011) [119]. This commitment was explained by a higher job satisfaction meaning that there is a significant positive correlation between the two. Harmon et al. (2003) [148] and Griffin et al. (2010) [149] shared the same point of view and agreed on the fact that the high the commitment to work level, the more the job satisfaction.

VI. Conclusion

Fresh graduates' attitudes are very complex and need a great attention. Various factors have proved to play an important role in satisfying and retaining these fresh graduates who are mostly young generations and keeping them has proved to help in the continuous growth of an organization. These factors as studied by various researchers were discussed in details throughout this research article as well as the theories that studied this issue. However still many factors can be explored in the area of fresh graduates' satisfaction and retention. These factors may be mainly related to the labor market like unionization, labor status, geographical location of the job, nature of the job such as formal or informal, related to private or public sector and many others; obvious to mention that these studies should be carried out by human resources as well as economists professionals. Besides, there is a need for further studies concerning the cultural factor and its relation with job satisfaction and retention (Serhan and Tsangari, 2015) [52]; especially that it has been shown (Hofstede et al., 2010) [17] that human behavior at work is affected by the differences of values across national cultures.

This literature review adds insights of great value to both the academic and the business community. From the academic point of view, it contributes to the knowledge of fresh graduates' retention by a collection of concise but detailed information about the previous works concerning the various theories and factors related to this issue, which has been later tested with an empirical study. For the business world, alternatively, this research offers a set of ideas that will help to determine which factors should be specifically considered for retaining their fresh graduates in a challenging labor market.

References

Journal Papers:

- [1]. M. Cleveland, M. Laroche and R. Hallab, Globalization, culture, religion, and values: Comparing consumption patterns of Lebanese Muslims and Christians, *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (8), 2013, 958 - 967.
- [2]. M.E. Menon, N. Pashourtidou, A. Polycarpou, and P. Pashardes, Students' expectations about earnings and employment and the experience of recent university graduates: Evidence from Cyprus. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 32, 2011, 805–813.
- [3]. N. Tektas, M. Tektas., Z. Polata, and A. S. Topuza., Comparing the expectations of undergraduate and graduate degree students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2, 2010, 1244–1248.
- [4]. W. Mroueh., Labor laws in Lebanon Heat up on heels of ILO Signing. *The Daily Star Lebanon*. Nov 28, 2012.
- [5]. D. Jackson and E. Chapman, Empirically derived competency profiles for Australian business graduates and their implications for industry and business schools. *The International Journal of Management Education*. 10, 2012, 112-128.
- [6]. B. Ulrich, Successful strategies for new graduates. *Nurse Leader*, 2003.
- [7]. C. Chiru, S.G. Ciuchete, G.G. Lefter and E. Paduretu, A cross country study on university graduates key competencies. An employer's perspective. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 46, 2012, 4258 – 4262.
- [8]. P. Agénor, M.K. Nabli, T. Yousef and H. Tarp Jensen, Labor market reforms, growth, and unemployment in labor-exporting countries in the Middle East and North Africa. *Journal of Policy Modeling*. 29, 2007, 277-309.
- [9]. R.K. Coll and K.E. Zegwaard, Perceptions of desirable graduate competencies for science and technology new graduate. *Research in Science and Technological Education*. 24, 2006, 29-58.
- [10]. S. Shujaat, F.E.A. Cheema and A. Manzour, Importance of Motivational Factors among Fresh Graduates Employees. *IBT Journal of Business Studies*. 9 (1), 2014, 102 - 113
- [11]. M.M. Parvin and M.M. Nurul Kabir, Factors Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction of Pharmaceutical Sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1 (9), 2011, 113 – 123.
- [12]. M.A. Whaba and L.G. Bridwell, Maslow Reconsidered: A Review of Research on the Need Hierarchy Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 15 (2), 1976, 212 - 240.
- [13]. R. Cianci and P.A. Gambrel, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: Does it apply in a Collectivist Culture. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*. 8 (2), 2003, 143 – 161.
- [14]. G. Hoftsede, The Cultural Relativity of the Quality of Life Concept. *Academy of Management Review*. 9 (3), 1984, 389 – 398.
- [15]. D. Kernick, Rebuilding Maslow's Pyramid on an Evolutionary Foundation. *Psychology Today*, 2010.
- [16]. D.T. Kernick, V. Griskevicius, S.L. Neuberg and M. Schaller, Renovating the Pyramid of Needs: Contemporary Extensions Built Upon Ancient Foundations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 5 , 2010, 292.
- [17]. F. Herzberg, The Motivation-Hygiene Concept and Problems of Manpower. *Personnel Administrator*. 27, 1964, 3 – 7.
- [18]. K. Holloway, Goal Setting for Self-improvement. *Scholastic Coach*. 61 (5), 1996.
- [19]. J. Goldthorpe, D. Lockwood, F. Bechhofer and J. Platt, The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior. *The Economic Journal*. 79 (313), 1969, 167-169.
- [20]. N. King, Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction. *Psychological Bulletin*. 74 (1), 1970, 18 – 31.
- [21]. C. Aldefer, An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 4 (2), 1969, 142 – 175.
- [22]. J. Hunter, J. Rauschenberger and N. Schmitt, A test of the Need Hierarchy Concept by a Markoy Model of Change in Need Strength. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 25 (4), 1990, 654 – 670.
- [23]. D.C. McClelland and D.H. Burnham, Power is the Great Motivator. *Harvard Business Review*. 54 (2), 1976, 100 – 110.
- [24]. C.L. Jurkiewicz, T.M. Massey and R.G. Brown, Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Public Productivity and Management Review*. 21 (3), 1998, 230 – 250.
- [25]. E.E. Lawler, Expectancy Theory and Job Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 9, 1973, 482 – 503.
- [26]. W. Maloney and J. McFillen, Valence of and Satisfaction with Job Outcomes. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*. 111(1), 1985, 53-73.
- [27]. W. Maloney and J. McFillen, Motivational Implications of Construction Work. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*. 112(1), 1986, 137-51.
- [28]. J. Adams, Toward an Understanding of Inequity. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 67 (5), 1963, 422 – 436.
- [29]. J. Adams, Inequity in Social Exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 62, 1965, 335 – 343.
- [30]. R.C. Huseman, J.D. Hatfield and E.W. Miles, A New Perspective on Equity Theory: The Equity Sensitivity Construct. *The Academy of Management Review*. 12 (2), 1987, 222 – 234.
- [31]. E.A. Locke, Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational behavior and human performance*. 3(2), 1968, 157-189.
- [32]. E.A. Locke and G.P. Latham, Building a Practically Useful Theory of Goal Setting and Task Motivation: A 35 Year Odyssey. *American Psychologist*. 57 (9), 2002, 705 – 717.
- [33]. E.A. Locke and G.P. Latham, New Directions in Goal- Setting Theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 15 (5), 2006, 265 – 268.
- [34]. M.E. Schweitzer, L. Ordenez and B. Douma, Goal Setting as a Motivator of Unethical Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*. 47 (3), 2004, 422 – 432.
- [35]. K.E. Hart, F. Scholar, W.A. Kritsonis and D. Alumnus, Critical Analysis of an Original Writing on Social Learning Theory: Immitation of Film-Mediated Aggressive Models by::Albert Bandura, Dorothea Ross and Sheila A. Ross. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*. 20 (3), 2006.
- [36]. J.R. Hackman and G.R. Oldham, Development of Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 60, 1975, 159 – 170.
- [37]. J.R. Hackman and G.R. Oldham, Motivation Through the Design of Work. Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 1976, 250 – 279.
- [38]. M. Rungtusanatham and J.C. Anderson, A Clarification on Conceptual and Methodological Issues Related to the Job Characteristics Model. *Journal of Operations Management*. 14(4), 1996, 357-367.
- [39]. B.B. Aguenza and A.P. Som, Motivational Factors of Employee Retention and Engagement in Organizations. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*. 1(6), 2012, 88 – 95.
- [40]. T.R. Mitchell, B.C. Holtom, T.W. Lee, C.J. Sablynski and M. Erez, Why People Stay: Using Job Embeddedness to Predict Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*. 44, 2001, 1102-1121.
- [41]. J.P. Meyer and N.J. Allen, A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 1, 1991, 61 – 89.

- [42]. A. Howard, L. Liu, R.S. Wellins and S. Williams, Employee Retention in China 2007. *SHRM Research Center*, 2007.
- [43]. J. Fitz-enz, Getting – and Keeping – Good Employees. *Personnel Publications*, 67 (8), 1990.
- [44]. M.C. Osteraker, Measuring Motivation in a Learning Organization. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 11 (2), 1999, 73 – 77.
- [45]. P.L. Walker, A Bioarchaeological Perspective on the History of Violence. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 2001, 573 – 596.
- [46]. A.E. Clark, What Really Matters in a Job? Hedonic Measurement Using Quit Data. *Labour Economics*. 1.8 (2), 2001, 223–242.
- [47]. D.H. Pritchard, Recent Work on Epistemic Value. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 44, 2007, 85 – 110.
- [48]. F. Dochy, M. Segers, D. Gijbels and K. Stryven, Assessment Engineering: Breaking Down Barriers between Teaching and Learning and Assessment. In *Rethinking assessment in higher education: learning for the longer term*. Edited by: Boud D, Falchikov N. Oxford: Routledge, 7, 2009, 87 – 100.
- [49]. A. Khan, A. Nawaz and S. Khan, The Contextual Impacts on Job Satisfaction of employees in the Developing States Like Pakistan. *Universal Journal of Education and General Studies*. 1 (5), 2012, 136 – 145.
- [50]. M.J. Shah, M. Ur-Rehman, G. Akhtar, H. Zafar and A. Riaz, Job Satisfaction and Motivation of Teachers of Public Educational Institutions. *International Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3 (8), 2012.
- [51]. S. Rast and A. Tourani, Evaluation of Employees' Job Satisfaction and Role of Gender Difference: An Empirical Study at Airline Industry in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3 (7), 2012.
- [52]. M. Lai and Y. Chen, Self-efficiency, Effort, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention: The Effects of Personal Characteristics on Organization Performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*. 3 (4), 2012.
- [53]. E.O. Olorunsola, Job Satisfaction and Personal Characteristics of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 3 (1), 2012, 46 – 50.
- [54]. S. Donohue and J. Heywood, Job Satisfaction, Comparison Income and Gender: Evidence from the NLSY. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25, 2004, 211–34.
- [55]. D.W. Keith, M. Ha-Duong and J.K. Stolaroff, Climate Strategy with Co2 Capture from the Air. *Clim Chang*, 74 (1-3), 2005, 15-47.
- [56]. E. McDuff, The Gender Paradox in Work Satisfaction and the Protestant Clergy. *Sociology of Religion*. 62, 2001, 1–21.
- [57]. A. Long, Happily Ever After? A Study of Job Satisfaction in Australia. *The Economic Record*. 81, 2005, 303-321.
- [58]. M.E. Ward and P.J. Sloane, Non-pecuniary Advantages versus Pecuniary Disadvantages: Job Satisfaction among Male and Female Academics in Scottish Universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*. 47, 2000, 273-303.
- [59]. M. Carrell and N. Elbert, Some Personal and Organizational Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Postal Clerks. *Academy of Management Journal*. 17 (2), 1974, 368-373.
- [60]. V.S. DeSantis and S.L. Durst, Comparing Job Satisfaction among Public and Private-sector Employees. *American Review of Public Administration*. 26 (3), 1996, 327-343, 1996.
- [61]. R.P. Tett, J.R. Steele and R.S. Beauregard, Broad and Narrow Measures on Both Sides of the Personality-job Performance Relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 2003, 335-356.
- [62]. T. Yoshikawa and A.A. Rasheed, Family Control and Ownership Monitoring in Family Controlled Firms in Japan. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47 (2), 2010, 274 – 295.
- [63]. S.D. Saleh and J.L. Otis, Age and Level of Job Satisfactio. *Personnel Psychology*, 17 (4), 1964, 425 – 430.
- [64]. T. Saner and S.Z. Yüpoğlu, The Age and Job Satisfaction Relationship in Higher Education. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 2012, 1020 – 1026.
- [65]. M.A. Ahmed, The Role of Self-Esteem and Optimism in Job Satisfaction among Teachers of Private Universities in Bangladesh. *Asian Business Review*, 1 (1), 2012.
- [66]. C. Lee and J. Lee, Analysis of the Relationships between the Hospitality Workforce and Job-Satisfaction Factors according to Age, Gender, Native Language and Racial Ethnicity. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 1, 5, 2012.
- [67]. S.O. Mokaya, J.L. Musau, J. Wagoki and K. Karanja, Effects of Organizational Work Conditions on Employee Job Satisfaction in the Hotel Industry in Kenya. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 2 (2), 2013.
- [68]. A.S. Nurullah, Predictors of Job Satisfaction among Emerging Adults in Alberta, Canada. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (2), 2010.
- [69]. T. Feyzi, S.Y. Danesh and S.L. Jaliseh, The Effect of Managers' General Accountability on Teachers' Job Satisfaction (A Study in Schools of Amlash City). *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (3), 2012, 2192 – 2199.
- [70]. M. Hsu and K. Chen, A Study of the Relationship among Self-Motivation, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of University Faculty Members in Taiwan. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and their Implications*, 3 (3), 2012, 7.
- [71]. T.J. Zagenczyk, K.D. Scott, R. Gibney, A.J. Murrell and J.B. Thatcher, Social Influence and Perceived Organizational Support: A Social Networks Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*, 111(2), 2010, 127-138.
- [72]. A.J. Wagner, Participation's Effects on Performance and Satisfaction: A Reconsideration of Research Evidence. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 1994, 312–30.
- [73]. F.K. Muindi, The Relationship between Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in the School of Business, University of Nairobi. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2011.
- [74]. K.K. Bhatti and T.M. Qureshi, Impact of Employee Participation on Job Satisfaction, Employee Commitment and Employee Productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3 (2), 2007, 54 – 68.
- [75]. R. Weng, C. Huang, W. Tsai, L. Chang, S. Lin and M. Lee, Exploring the Impact of Mentoring Functions on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of New Staff Nurses. *BMC Health Services Research*, 10, 2012, 240.
- [76]. S. Song and D. Olshfsk, Friends at Work: A Comparative Study of Work Attitudes in Seoul City Government and New Jersey State Government. *Administration and Society*, 40(2), 2008, 147-169.
- [77]. P. Thoms, J.J. Dose and K.S. Scott, Relationship Between Accountability, Job Satisfaction, and Trust. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13 (3), 2012, 307 – 323.
- [78]. N. Mustapha and Z.C. Zakaria, Measuring Job Satisfaction from the Perspective of Interpersonal Relationship and Faculty Workload among Academic Staff at Public Universities in Kelantan, Malaysia. *Entrepreneurship Vision: Innovation, Development Sustainability, and Economic Growth*, 2012, 589 – 594.
- [79]. N. Mehmood, S. Irum, K. Ahmed and A. Sultana, A study of Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction (Evidence from Pakistan). *Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research*, 4 (6), 2012, 673 – 684.
- [80]. M.S. Sehgal, Job Satisfaction of Bank Employees in Shimla “A Comparative Study of Private and Public Sector Bank (Axis Bank and UCO Bank)”. *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services and Management Research*, 1 (7), 2012.
- [81]. R.V. Shidhaye, D.S. Divekar, G. Gaurav and R. Shidhaye, Influence of Working Conditions on Job Satisfaction in Indian Anesthesiologists: A Cross Sectional Survey. *Anaesth, Pain and Intensive Care*, 15 (1), 2011.
- [82]. J.F. Kinzl, H. Knotzer, C. Traweger, W. Lederer, T. Heidegger and A. Benzer, Influence of Working Conditions on Job Satisfaction in Anaesthetists. *BR J Anaesthesia*, 94, 2005, 211 – 215.

- [83]. D. Bakotić and T. Babić, Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4 (2), 2013.
- [84]. D.E. Bowen and E.E. Lawler, The Empowerment of Service Workers: What, Why, How and When? *Sloan Management Review*, 33 (3), 1992, 31-9.
- [85]. R. Malini and P. Pandian, Organizational Authority and Job Satisfaction. *Indian Journal of Research*, 2 (3), 2013, 14 – 16.
- [86]. T. Oshagbemi, Satisfaction with Co-Workers' Behavior. *Employee Relations*, 22 (1), 2000, 88-100.
- [87]. D. Card, A. Mas, E. Moretti and E. Saez, Inequality at Work: The Effects of Peer Salaries on Job Satisfaction. *American Economic Review*, 102 (6), 2012, 2981 – 3003.
- [88]. M.R. Dizgah, M.G. Chegini and R. Bisokhan, Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance in Guilan Public Sector. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (2), 2012, 1735 – 1741.
- [89]. F.G. Ghaziani, A. Safania and S.M. Tayebi, Impact of Organizational Justice Perceptions on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: The Iran's Ministry of Sport Perspective. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 6 (7), 2012, 179 – 188.
- [90]. A. Naveed, A. Usman and F. Bushra, Promotion: A Predictor of Job Satisfaction A Study of Glass Industry of Lahore (Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (16), 2011, 301 – 305.
- [91]. V.D. Kosteas, Job Satisfaction and Promotions. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 50 (1), 2010, 174 – 194.
- [92]. S. Ramlall, Managing Employee Retention as a Strategy for Increasing Organizational Competitiveness. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 8 (2), 2003, 63 – 72.
- [93]. D.J. Barr-Anderson, M. AuYoung, M.C. Whitt-Glover, B.A. Glenn and A.K. Yancey, Integration of Short Bouts of Physical Activity into Organizational Routine: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 40(1), 2011, 76-93.
- [94]. M. Noorbakhsh and S. Ghambari, The Effect of 10 Weeks Physical Activity on Job Satisfaction of University Non-Athlete Male Staffs. *Annals of Biological Research*, 4 (6), 2013, 254 – 259.
- [95]. Y.B. Limbu, C. Jayachandran and B.J. Babin, Does Information and Communication Technology Improve Job Satisfaction? The Moderating Role of Sales Technology Orientation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43 (7), 2014, 1236 – 1245.
- [96]. M. Mcmurtrey, V. Grover, J.T.C. Teng and N.J. Lightner, Job Satisfaction of Information Technology Workers: The Impact of Career Orientation and Task Automation in a Case Environment. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19 (2), 2002, 273 – 302.
- [97]. G.A. Attar and R.J. Sweis, The Relationship Between Information Technology Adoption and Job Satisfaction in Contracting Companies in Jordan. *Journal of Information Technology in Construction*, 15, 2010, 44 – 63.
- [98]. G.R. Oldham and J.R. Hackman, Not What it Was and Not What it Will Be: The Future of Job Design Research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31 (2-3), 2010, 463 – 479.
- [99]. F. Morgeson and S. Humphrey, The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and Validating a Comprehensive Measure for assessing Job Design and the Nature of Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (6), 2006, 1321 – 1339.
- [100]. A.M. Grant and S.K. Parker, Redesigning Work Design Theories: The Rise of Relational and Proactive Perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3, 2009, 37 – 375.
- [101]. S. Dugguh and A. Dennis, Job Satisfaction Theories: Traceability to Employee Performance in Organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 16 (5), 2014, 11 – 18.
- [102]. K.L. Sommer and M. Kulkarni, Does constructive performance feedback improve citizenship intentions and job satisfaction? The roles of perceived opportunities for advancement, respect, and mood. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 23(2), 2012, 177-201.
- [103]. T.A. Judge, J.E. Bono, C.J. Thoresen and G.K. Patton, The Job Satisfaction – Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3), 2001, 376 – 407.
- [104]. A.K. Korman, Toward a hypothesis of work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 1970, 31–41.
- [105]. E.E. Sorensen, E.D. Seebeck, C.A. Scherb, J.P. Specht and J.L. Loes, The Relationship between RN Job Satisfaction and Accountability. *West J Nurs Res*, 31 (7), 2009, 872 – 888.
- [106]. R. Hodson, Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women more Dissatisfied? *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30 (3), 1989, 385 - 399.
- [107]. J. Harmon, D.J. Scotti, S. Behson and G. Farias, Effects of High-Involvement Work Systems on Employee Satisfaction and Service Costs in Veterans Healthcare. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 48 (6), 2003, 393 – 406.
- [108]. M.L. Griffin, N.L. Hogan, E.G. Lambert, K.A. Tucker-Gail and D.N. Baker, Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 2010, 239-255.

Books:

- [109]. S.M. Jex and T.W. Britt, *Organizational psychology* (Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 2008).
- [110]. A.H. Maslow, *Motivation and personality* (New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954).
- [111]. F. Herzberg, B. Mausner and B. Snyderman, *The motivation to work* (New York: John Wiley and Sons: 2nd edition, 1959).
- [112]. F. Herzberg, *Work and the nature of man* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966).
- [113]. C. Aldefer, *Existence, relatedness and growth: Human needs in organizational settings* (New York. Free Press, 1972).
- [114]. D.C. McClelland, *Power: The inner experience* (New York: Irvington, 1975).
- [115]. L.B. Mohr, *Explaining organizational behavior* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982).
- [116]. V.H. Vroom, *Work and motivation* (New York, NY: Wiley, 1964).
- [117]. V.H. Vroom, *Work and motivation* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1982).
- [118]. A. Bandura, *Social cognitive theory* (Stanford University, 1989).
- [119]. D.M. Rousseau, *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements* (Sage Publications, USA, 1995).
- [120]. J.R. Hackman and G.R. Oldham, *Work redesign* (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1980).
- [121]. R. Hoppock, *Job satisfaction* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1935).
- [122]. P.C. Smith, L.M. Kendall and C.L. Hulin, *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969).
- [123]. D. Schultz, *Psychology and industry today* (New York: MacMillian Company, 1982).
- [124]. K. Wexley and G. Yukl, *Organizational behavior and personnel psychology* (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1984).
- [125]. L. Siegal and I. Lane, *Personnel and organizational psychology* (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1982).
- [126]. K. Davis and J.W. Nestrom, *Human behavior at work: Organizational behavior* (7th edition, McGraw Hill, New York, 1985).
- [127]. P.E. Spector, *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1997).
- [128]. D. Statt, *The routledge dictionary of business management* (3rd edition, Routledge Publishing, Detroit, 2004).

- [129]. J.L. Mullins, *Management and organizational behavior* (7th Edition. Pearson Education Limited. Essex, 2005).
- [130]. M. Armstrong, *A handbook of human resource management practice* (10th Edition. Kogan Page Publishing. London, 2006).
- [131]. B.S. Kaliski, *Encyclopedia of business and finance* (2nd edition. Thompson Gale. Detroit, 2007).
- [132]. J.M. George and G.R. Jones, *Understanding and managing organizational behavior* (5th Edition. Pearson/Prentice Hall. New Jersey, 2008).
- [133]. M.M. Gruneberg, *Understanding job satisfaction* (New York: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1979).
- [134]. M. Rosenberg, *Society and the adolescent self-image* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965).
- [135]. D.J. Treiman, *Occupational prestige in comparative perspective* (New York: Academic Press, 1977).

Chapters in Books:

- [136]. A.K. Korman, *Self-enhancement and self-protection: Toward a theory of work motivation* (In M. Erez, U. Kleinbeck and H. Thierry Eds., *Work motivation in the context of a globalizing economy*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2001) 121 – 130.

Theses:

- [137]. L.A. Okoth, *A survey of the factors that determine the level of job satisfaction among teachers in top ranking private schools in Nairobi*, Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi, 2003.
- [138]. U. Gumato, *Survey of the relationship between the perceived empowerment and job satisfaction of employees in commercial banks in Nairobi*, Unpublished MBA Thesis, University of Nairobi, 2003.
- [139]. D.S. Khainga, *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among customer care representatives at Safaricom Limited*, Unpublished MBA Project, University of Nairobi, 2006.
- [140]. P.M. Siegel, *Prestige in the American occupational structure*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Department of Sociology, 1971.

Proceedings Papers:

- [141]. C. Serhan and H. Tsangari, Retention of Fresh Graduates: Identification of Determinant Factors through a Modified Job Characteristics Model. Global Business Conference 2015 (CBC 2015) - Sibenik, Croatia, September 30th – October 3rd. 2015, 200-202.
- [142]. A. Tourani and S. Rast, Effect of Employees' Communication and Participation on Employees Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study on Airline Companies in Iran. *International Conference on Economics, Trade and Development. IPEDR*, IACSIT Press, Singapore, 2012, 36.

Reports:

- [143]. Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, *The National Graduate Employability Blueprint 2012 – 2017*. Universiti Putra Malaysia Press, 2012.
- [144]. Eurofound, *ERM report 2012 - After Restructuring: Labour Markets, Working Conditions and Life Satisfaction*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2012.
- [145]. SHRM, *Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement. A Research Report by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM)*, 2011.
- [146]. A. Hytter, *Dark Side Leaders, Work Environment and Employee Health*. Retrieved from Växjö University, *Studies in Leadership, Entrepreneurship, and Organization*, 2008.
- [147]. I.U. Zeytinoglu and M. Denton, *Satisfied workers, Retained Workers: Effects of work and work environment on Homecare workers' Job satisfaction, Stress, Physical Health, and 18 Retention*. (CHSRF FCRSS: Candanian Health Services Research Foundation, Fondation canadienne de la recherché sur les services de sante'), 2005.
- [148]. Perista, H and Carrilho, P. *Feedback from Boss has Positive Impact on Worker Satisfaction*. European Observatory of Working Life (EurWORK), CESIS.
- [149]. World Bank, *Social Accountability in the Public Sector*. Washington DC: WBI Working Paper No.33641, 2012.