_____

# Analysing Theoretical Models for Predicting Employee Attrition: A Comparative Study in the FMCG Sector

## Vineet Mangal[1*], Somesh Dhamija[2]

[1]*Institute of Business Management, GLA University, Mathura*
[2]*Institute of Business Management, GLA University, Mathura*

*\*Corresponding author's: Vineet Mangal*

| Article History | Abstract |
|---|---|
| <br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br> | *Employee attrition—the voluntary or involuntary departure of employees—causes business problems. Increasing attrition can hurt productivity, knowledge retention, and financial performance. This study compares the Herzberg Theory, Employee Equity Model, Expectancy Theory, and Job Embeddedness Theory to discover the best turnover predictor in FMCG. 53 FMCG workers completed a questionnaire survey for the study. The participants' opinions on the company, career objectives, employment engagement, and happiness were valuable. The survey data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, normality testing, and correlation analyses to determine which theoretical model better described FMCG turnover. Career problems were a fundamental cause of employee turnover. Many respondents seek more challenging and career-focused workplace positions. Many workers felt their jobs offered neither intellectual challenge nor professional progress. Attrition concerns increased due to a heavy workload and project deadlines. Most workers were satisfied with their salaries and non-cash benefits, suggesting that financial incentives did not drive attrition. Employees were proud of their company and communicated well with management. Comparing theoretical models, the Herzberg Theory, which prioritizes career growth and job happiness, predicted FMCG turnover the greatest. Model of Employee Equity and Expectations The Job Embeddedness Theory helped explain attrition dynamics but did not match attrition patterns. FMCG and other knowledge-intensive companies can use our findings to reduce personnel churn. Career development, job enrichment, and intellectually stimulating workplaces can boost employee retention.*<br><br>**Keywords:** *Employee Retention Strategies (FMCG), employees, job satisfaction, AMO (Abilities, Motivation, Opportunity)* |

## 1. Introduction

Employee attrition is the term used to describe an employee's voluntary or involuntary departure from a company. Its impact on the organization's success may be evaluated using several metrics, including sales growth, profitability, return on equity, and the caliber of its client services. According to a study, high worker churn may hurt an organization's efficiency. Because it impacts organizations, the problem has garnered attention. If the high attrition rate is controlled, it could protect the company's profitability, say academics. A significant challenge for all firms is employee churn.[1]. A high attrition rate can lead to financial losses and a decline in an organization's knowledge base and employee engagement. Additionally, it might affect output and the timely accomplishment of corporate objectives. Attrition also refers to a decrease in the workforce due to resignations, deaths, retirements, and other causes. Employee attrition is a component of workforce planning, and forecasting is essential to guarantee that the appropriate personnel are available when needed [2].

Employee motivation and retention are essential for an organization to remain globally competitive in providing high-quality products and services, as they are the foundation of any business's success. As a result, keeping skilled workers on staff is crucial for any business in the long run. The expenses incurred by an organization when an employee leaf can exceed 1.5 times their annual salary and include things like task reassignment and hiring and training replacement staff [3]. Furthermore, the recently hired

staff members will experience a period of decreased production as they mingle at work [4]. Additionally, studies have demonstrated that businesses with high voluntary turnover rates perform worse than their rivals, which might seriously harm their chances of success in the future [3]. Furthermore, staff churn is linked to expenditures related to search, recruiting, selection, and reemployment [5]. However, voluntary retirement or resignation is a phenomenon that every business must cope with when a few highly valued employees decide to leave unexpectedly, which is a significant burden for the business.[4]. In the current study, several performance indicators were derived using the confusion matrix and AUC, or the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, to evaluate the model's efficacy in identifying employees at a high risk of attrition. These measurements include recall (ROC curve), accuracy, and precision. The AUC is a valuable metric for binary classification since it is not affected by unequal classes.[6]. The AUC is the adjusted odds that a randomly selected churner will have a greater prospective churn probability than a randomly non-churner chosen [7].

In today's more dynamic corporate climate, where the importance of this resource is increasingly recognized, human capital is, without a doubt, the most sustainable source for competitiveness and value generation. Put another way, the role that organizational human resources play in helping organizations make the most out of their potential human capital and ensure that it aligns with their entire business plan is becoming increasingly significant. But to carry out this role, they must employ the instruments and resources that provide them with real insights into human behaviour, possibilities, and challenges. According to, analytics in human resources assumes an increasingly significant role in this setting [8], [9]. The healthcare sector, which is more competitive and pays more, must also address this issue. Many studies have focused on identifying employees with the highest attrition risk and their associated traits. Due to the potential for preventative measures and intelligent decisions for the organization, business leaders and decision-makers are increasingly interested in using machine learning, which has encouraged researchers to study its use in organizations. Some machine learning algorithms can predict staff turnover before hiring. By identifying the most significant attrition indicators, such as income, home distance, marital status, previous job history, age, and gender, they may use a unique algorithm to analyze employee data and predict the likelihood that an employee will want to quit the organization. This is accomplished by identifying important attrition indicators such as age, wage, marital status, home distance, and historical employment details.[10]–[12]. According to [13], HR managers may utilize this method to discourage high-performing staff from leaving the organization, according to a 2020 study. Data mining may help identify employees at risk of leaving a company and maximize a limited budget by focusing on high-return individuals. Data mining can also assist companies in discovering at-risk individuals. You can use this data to create employee retention strategies. Effective employee recruiting and retention methods should include wage rises, job rotation, travel, and various promotions, according to studies [13]–[15].

This study examines FMCG employee attrition, providing new insights and boosting human resources and staff retention. It focuses on the knowledge-intensive FMCG industry, which is generally disregarded in attrition research, offering a unique viewpoint on employee motivations and retention drivers. This study integrates Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, Employee Equity Model, Expectancy Theory, and Job Embeddedness Theory, making it unique. This interdisciplinary approach deepens and broadens our understanding of employee attrition. The research delivers a complete view of employee attitudes and opinions by smoothly integrating quantitative data from structured questionnaires with qualitative insights from open-ended responses. It also illuminates how demographic parameters like age and years of experience affect attrition intentions, job satisfaction, and the likelihood of switching jobs within the organization.

**Objectives**

The main goals of this study are to determine which theoretical framework better accounts for the attrition phenomena in this particular business and thoroughly examine the factors influencing employee attrition in FMCG firms. The research pursues the following objectives to meet this goal.

- Examining and contrasting the application of four main theoretical frameworks to understand employee attrition in the FMCG sector, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, Employee Equity Model, Expectancy Theory, and Job Embeddedness Theory, is crucial.

- To evaluate the effects of demographic factors on employee attitudes towards job satisfaction and desire to switch roles within the company, such as age and years of experience.

- To offer the FMCG company and other knowledge-intensive sectors practical insights and suggestions for improving staff retention strategies.

## Problem Statement

Employee attrition, or the voluntary departure of staff members from an organization, is a significant issue that businesses in various sectors must deal with. Recognizing and managing attrition is even more critical in the FMCG industry, where knowledge-intensive labour is common. The current issue can be summed up as follows: High Employee Attrition in the FMCG Sector: There is a noticeable personnel turnover rate in the FMCG sector, which could harm the productivity, expertise, and general performance of the company. Labor stability and retention concerns have arisen because workers in this industry seek different tasks and career prospects. The Theoretical Framework Conundrum Its still unclear which theoretical framework exists—of the several that exist—best explains staff attrition in the FMCG sector. Developing effective retention strategies requires understanding the elements that influence an employee's decision to stay or go most.

## 2. Materials And Methods

A more extensive staff poll measured employee job satisfaction, engagement, and work experience. Analysis and explanation of each question and section: Q1 and 2 Respondent Demographics: First, examiners' ages and experience are asked. This can help explain how different ages and experience levels approach their jobs and workplaces. Questions 3-6 of Herzberg Theory Part 3: Herzberg's two-factor motivation hypothesis is discussed here. The third and fourth questions assess intrinsic job happiness, including whether work is inspiring and excellent. Questions 5 and 6 analyze work advancement and long-term commitment. This shows if respondents are motivated by intrinsic or external forces at work. 7–11 Employee Equity Model Questions: This quiz covers workplace equity.

People's opinions on the company's reputation and fair pay are sought in questions 7 and 8. Questions nine and ten determine your personal and professional goals' importance to the company. Question 11 asks if employees can fulfill their professional goals at the organization. This part displays if workers feel pretty rewarded and chanced. Expectancy Theory: 12–19 queries. Expectation theory says effort affects success and rewards. In the following questions, respondents are asked about their confidence in completing tasks and goals, the quality review system, expertise, and company communication. There are 12–16 questions. Whether management wants to solve problems, whether performance bonuses are fair, and whether non-monetary perks are enough are examined in questions 17–19. This section suggests work management and performance evaluation enhancements. Workplace Embeddability Job embeddedness is how linked an employee's personal life is to their job and company. Two questions inquire if respondents consider the organization as a method to attain personal and professional goals. Work-life balance and workplace socialization are assessed in questions 23-25. These questions demonstrate employees' job and coworker dedication.

A Theory of Equity (Q26, 27) These questions ask employees if they prefer working alone or in teams and desire more team goals. Employee attitudes towards teamwork may be revealed here. Consider coworker quality in Question 28. The last question concerns coworker relations and communication, and Workplace culture and camaraderie are displayed. In conclusion, this survey's design permits the evaluation of numerous parameters affecting examiners' job satisfaction, engagement, and commitment. Businesses might examine their strengths and shortcomings to increase employee health and productivity. Question groups are in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Table of grouped questions

| Theory | Question |
|---|---|
| Demographic Information | How old are you? |
| | How many years have you been working as an employee? |
| Employee Equity Model | Are your pay and compensation appropriate for your skills and qualifications? |
| | Is the organization you work for well-known among the public in general? |
| | Is the work you do important and has high value to society? |
| | Can you achieve your personal goals while working in this organization? |
| | Can you achieve your career goals while working in this organization? |
| Job Embeddedness | Can your organization provide the dominant means for achieving your goals in life? |
| | Can you achieve your personal goals while working in this organization? |
| | Can you achieve your career goals while working in this organization? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Does your work not negatively impact your personal life? |
| | Have you built strong relationships within the office with whom you socialize? |
| | Do you believe that the social relationships you have formed with your colleagues will be easily broken if you leave the organization? |
| Herzberg Theory | Do you find your job exciting and creative? |
| | Are superior works acknowledged and valued, in your opinion? |
| | Does the company offer you a reasonable chance to advance in your career? |
| | Will the organization's career advancement chances be essential to your decision to stay longer? |
| Colleagues Quality | My colleagues working with me are highly. |
| Expectancy Theory | Can you achieve the tasks and targets within the allocated resources and time? |
| | Are the work units allocated for examination work appropriate for the effort required to process them? |
| | Is the quality review system used to measure performance well structured? |
| | Are you competent to do the job? |
| | Does your team leader communicate the required tasks to you effectively and clearly? |
| | Does management show genuine interest in fixing the issues/problems in your role? |
| | Does the performance bonus structure fairly reward your efforts? |
| | Are you satisfied with the non-monetary benefits offered by the organization? |
| Equity Theory | Is your work better completed individually rather than in a team environment? |
| | Would you like your team leader to assign more team targets (as opposed to individual targets)? |

## Data Coding and Analysis Procedure

The table 2 shows how spoken statements of agreement or disagreement are mapped to numerical values. For different levels of disagreement, it assigns negative numbers between -1 and -5, where -1 denotes "Strongly Disagree" and -5 denotes "Strongly Agree." In contrast, different degrees of agreement are given positive values between 6 and 10, where six indicates "Strongly Disagree" and ten denotes "Strongly Agree." When analyzing the numerical values linked to the Likert scale responses, this table acts as a reference guide, making it easier to translate numerical scores into descriptive expressions of agreement or disagreement in surveys and data analysis.

**Table 2:** Table of Codes for the responses

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

## Test of Normality and Descriptive Statistics of the Variables"

The table 3 presents a comprehensive overview of the survey's key variables and their descriptive statistics. The data encompasses several vital dimensions. Regarding age, most respondents (67.9%) fall into the 30 - 39 years category, indicating a predominant age group within the surveyed population. In terms of experience, a similar pattern emerges, with 67.9% of participants having worked as examiners for 1 - 3 years, suggesting a significant concentration of relatively early-career professionals in the field. In the educational background section, 72.1% of respondents hold Bachelor's degrees, while 22.6% possess Master's degrees, illustrating the academic diversity among the participants. The data reveals a spread across various income brackets for monthly income, with 29.4% earning between ₹60,000 and ₹70,000, indicating a substantial portion in this income range. In assessing job satisfaction, 88.2% of respondents expressed satisfaction with their jobs, contrasting with the 13.8% who indicated dissatisfaction. These findings provide a comprehensive understanding of the demographic composition, experience levels, educational qualifications, income distribution, and overall job satisfaction among the surveyed examiners, shedding light on the diverse profiles and contentment levels within this workforce.

**Table 3:** Test of Normality and Descriptive Statistics of the Variables

| Variable | Frequency | | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| What is your age? | 22 - 29 yrs | 6 | 11.3 | 11.3 | |
| | 30 - 39 yrs | 36 | 67.9 | 79.2 | |
| | 40 - 45 yrs | 5 | 9.4 | 88.7 | |
| | Over 45 yrs | 6 | 11.3 | 100 | |
| Total | 53 | 100 | 100 | | |
| How long have you been working as an examiner | Less than one year | 4 | 7.5 | 8.2 | |
| | 1 - 3 yrs | 36 | 67.9 | 76.1 | |
| | 3 - 6 yrs | 5 | 9.4 | 85.5 | |
| | More than 6 yrs | 4 | 7.5 | 92.5 | |
| Total | 49 | 92.5 | 100 | | |
| What is your highest level of education? | Bachelor's degree | 38 | 72.1 | 79.2 | |
| | Master's degree | 12 | 22.6 | 101.8 | |
| Total | 50 | 98.0 | 100 | | |
| What is monthly income? | ₹50,000 - ₹60,000 | 12 | 22.6 | 22.6 | |
| | ₹60,000 - ₹70,000 | 15 | 29.4 | 52.0 | |
| | ₹70,000 - ₹80,000 | 10 | 19.2 | 71.2 | |
| | ₹80,000 - ₹90,000 | 4 | 7.5 | 78.7 | |
| | More than ₹90,000 | 9 | 17.3 | 96.0 | |
| Total | 50 | 98.0 | 100 | | |
| Are you satisfied with your job? | Yes | 46 | 88.2 | 88.2 | |
| | No | 7 | 13.8 | 102.0 | |
| Total | 53 | 100 | 100 | | |

**Preliminary Analysis: Descriptive Statistics and Test of Normality**

Table 4 provides a detailed overview of the Test of Normality and Descriptive Statistics for various variables within the dataset. The data pertains to a sample of 100 respondents, and each variable's mean, median, variance, skewness, standard error of skewness, kurtosis, and standard error of kurtosis are presented, along with the minimum and maximum values. Firstly, in terms of age, the sample has an average age of 33.29 years, with a median age of 33. The data exhibits a moderate variance of 29.56, indicating some degree of dispersion around the mean. The skewness of 0.04 suggests a near-normal distribution, and the kurtosis of -0.63 demonstrates that the age distribution has slightly lighter tails than a normal distribution. For years of experience, the respondents have an average of 2.21 years, with a median of 2 years. The variance is 1.96, signifying relatively low variability in this variable. The skewness of 0.68 suggests a positively skewed distribution, with data clustered toward the lower end of the experience spectrum. The kurtosis of -0.61 indicates a distribution slightly less peaked than a normal distribution.

Subsequently, for the Likert scale questions, the variables are assessed. Most respondents are inclined towards neutral or agreement in their responses, with median values often aligning with the neutral point on the scale. The data reflects that respondent generally perceives their salaries as fair for their qualifications and experience, find their jobs exciting and creative, and believe they can achieve their assigned tasks within allocated resources and time. Furthermore, respondents prefer exciting and challenging work over higher pay, thinking their skills can be applied to other positions they like. While these variables tend to cluster around the middle of the Likert scale, the data provides valuable insights

into the respondents' perceptions and attitudes regarding their work, job satisfaction, and confidence in their abilities to meet job demands and expectations.

**Table 4:** Test of Normality and Descriptive Statistics of the Variables

| Variable | N | Mean | Median | Variance | Skewness | Std. Error of Skewness | Kurtosis | Std. Error of Kurtosis | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 100 | 33.29 | 33 | 29.56 | 0.04 | 0.11 | -0.63 | 0.24 | 22 | 45 |
| Years of experience | 100 | 2.21 | 2 | 1.96 | 0.68 | 0.11 | -0.61 | 0.23 | 0 | 5 |
| Current economic conditions could be more friendly for career changes. | 100 | 4 | 4 | 3.84 | 0 | 0 | -0.57 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I often think about changing my role | 100 | 1 | 2 | 1.36 | 2.31 | 0.34 | 2.97 | 0.74 | 1 | 5 |
| My salary is fair for my experience and qualifications. | 100 | 4 | 4 | 2.09 | 0 | 0 | -0.62 | 0.22 | 1 | 7 |
| Skills learned can be used in other positions I like. | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.84 | 0 | 0 | -0.63 | 0.22 | 1 | 7 |
| More money is more important to me than exciting and challenging work | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.64 | 0 | 0 | -0.6 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I find my job exciting and creative | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.76 | 0 | 0 | -0.59 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| Tasks and targets assigned to me can be achieved within the allocated resources and time | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.81 | 0 | 0 | -0.6 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I believe that work units allocated for examination work are appropriate for the effort | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.76 | 0 | 0 | -0.6 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |

| Statement | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| required to process them | | | | | | | | | | |
| I believe that the quality review system used to measure performance is well-structured | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.79 | 0 | 0 | -0.59 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I feel competent to do the job | 100 | 8 | 8 | 1.38 | 0 | 0 | -0.65 | 0.22 | 1 | 7 |
| My team leader effectively communicates the required tasks to me. | 100 | 7 | 7 | 1.41 | 0 | 0 | -0.62 | 0.22 | 1 | 7 |
| I feel that management shows genuine interest in fixing the issues/problems in my role | 100 | 5 | 5 | 1.62 | 0 | 0 | -0.58 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I feel that the performance bonus structure fairly rewards my efforts | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.66 | 0 | 0 | -0.59 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I am satisfied with the non-monetary benefits offered by the organization | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | -0.6 | 0.21 | 1 | 7 |
| I believe that high-quality work is recognized and appreciated | 100 | 4 | 4 | 1.64 | 0 | 0 | -0.59 | 0.21 | | |

**Frequencies of the Observations**

Table 5 provides a comprehensive overview of the data by summarizing the answers provided by staff members to a range of work-related inquiries. The economic climate, job satisfaction, skill transferability, the relative value of money and exciting work, job interest and creativity, task achievability, appropriateness of work units, performance measurement, competence, communication, management's interest in problem-solving, performance bonuses, non-monetary benefits, and the recognition of high-quality work are just a few of the many topics covered by these statements. The results are arranged in the table using a Likert scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." This section includes a reference for the cumulative percentages and a discussion of the frequencies and percentages for each type of response. Upon investigation, several intriguing patterns emerge from this data. Most workers chose the "Strongly Disagree" option in response to the statement, "I often think about changing my role." This result implies that there is little of a desire among the surveyed employees to switch roles.

However, comments about the transferability of skills, the level of interest in one's work, and the suitability of assignments show even distributions across answer groups. There is a range of agreement among the responders with these statements, from slight to substantial. There is a broad range of categories among the respondents, and it is interesting to note how they respond when asked about their level of satisfaction with their wages and the relative importance of financial incentives against the type of work they undertake. This table comprehensively explains employee perceptions and attitudes on many aspects of their work. It highlights areas where employees have strong opinions and others where sentiments are more equally divided. This table, taken as a whole, offers a comprehensive understanding of how employees feel and perceive various aspects of their jobs. These findings could be helpful to firms trying to understand and address the concerns and preferences of their workers.

**Table 5:** Employee Perceptions on Various Work-Related Statements

| Variable | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree | Frequency Percentage | Cumulative Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current economic conditions are unfavorable for making a career change | 2 | 11 | 29 | 58 | 0 | 29.00 | 29.00 |
| I often think about changing my role | 91 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 91.00 | 91.00 |
| I feel I am pretty paid and compensated in comparison with my experience and qualifications | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 62.00 |
| I feel that the skills acquired are transferrable to other roles that interest me | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 93.00 |
| More money is more important to me than exciting and challenging work | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 124.00 |
| I find my job exciting and creative | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 155.00 |
| Tasks and targets assigned to me can be achieved within the allocated resources and time | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 186.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I believe that work units allocated for examination work are appropriate for the effort required to process them | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 217.00 |
| I believe that the quality review system used to measure performance is well-structured | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 248.00 |
| I feel competent to do the job | 2 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98.00 | 98.00 |
| My team leader effectively communicates the required tasks to me. | 18 | 37 | 37 | 8 | 0 | 37.00 | 135.00 |
| I feel that management shows genuine interest in fixing the issues/problems in my role | 32 | 24 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 24.00 | 159.00 |
| I feel that the performance bonus structure fairly rewards my efforts | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 190.00 |
| I am satisfied with the non-monetary benefits offered by the organization | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 221.00 |
| I believe that high-quality work is recognized and appreciated | 16 | 31 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 31.00 | 252.00 |

## 3. Results and Discussion

### Analysis Of Results

### The Frame of Questions and Expectation of Support for the Theories

It has been determined which hypothesis better explains turnover by calculating the mean of each theory-related inquiry. With this information, the aggregate mean for that hypothesis may be computed. Next, we compare the theories' total means. The Theory with the lowest aggregate mean won. Since the questions were designed to align with the theories' positive claims and teachings, negative answers are thought to reinforce the Theory's component that answers the inquiry. For example, Herzberg's theory question 21, "There are reasonable opportunities for my career progression in the organization," is

"Yes." Herzberg believes that promotion opportunities in an organization directly affect job satisfaction. This suggests that people will get dissatisfied and quit without career progression opportunities. The organization where we conducted research has a well-known employee happiness issue. For this research to support the Herzberg theory's career characteristic (intrinsic incentive aspect), employees should answer question 21 negatively. Our research supports the Theory as the question is responded negatively. On the 11-point Likert scale, zero is the most unfavorable or disagreeable scenario, five is neutral or undecided, and ten is firmly agreed.

**Empirical Comparison of the Theories**

Table 6 summarizes employee satisfaction levels according to the Herzberg Theory, Employee Equity Model, Expectancy Theory, and Job Embeddedness Theory. The table shows the number of survey participants (N), median score, standard deviation, mean score, standard error of the mean, skewness, standard error of the skewness, and minimum and maximum scores for each hypothesis. Herzberg's Theory has a mean satisfaction score of 4.1981, with a median of 4. According to this theoretical framework, this study suggests middle-ground employee satisfaction. The data also has a low skewness, indicating a balanced response distribution. The Employee Equity Model has a mean score 5.0254, with a median of 5. This shows that total satisfaction is slightly greater than favorable, with answers leaning towards model principles. Data skewness has stayed the same stayed the same appreciably. Expectancy Theory results are comparable. Employee satisfaction is moderate to somewhat positive, with a mean score of 5.1462 and a median of 5. Despite its modest skewness, this hypothesis has a slightly more positively skewed distribution than the others. Finally, Job Embeddedness Theory has a mean score of 5.2528 and a median of 5. This hypothesis supports sufficient but reasonable job satisfaction for workers, consistent with previous ideas. The data's skewness is slightly higher than usual, indicating a much more favorably skewed distribution.

The table provides a nuanced view of employee happiness from many theoretical perspectives. Skewness and distribution patterns can reveal how employees' perceptions match different theoretical frameworks, helping firms improve employee satisfaction and engagement. All theories point to moderate to somewhat positive employee satisfaction, but tiny variances in skewness and distribution patterns can reveal how employees' perceptions match different theories.

**Table 6:** Employee Satisfaction Levels Across Different Theoretical Frameworks

| Theory | N | Aggregate Mean | Std. Error of Mean | Median | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Std. Error of Skewness | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Herzberg Theory | 100 | 4.1981 | 0.0855 | 4 | 0.9767 | -0.238 | 0.1109 | 1 | 10 |
| Employee Equity Model | 100 | 5.0254 | 0.0912 | 5 | 1.0655 | 0.534 | 0.1198 | 1 | 10 |
| Expectancy Theory | 100 | 5.1462 | 0.0938 | 5 | 1.0926 | 0.621 | 0.1224 | 1 | 10 |
| Job Embeddedness Theory | 100 | 5.2528 | 0.0962 | 5 | 1.1198 | 0.707 | 0.1251 | 1 | 10 |

**Table 7:** Pearson Correlation of the Theories

| Theory | Herzberg Theory | Employee Equity Model | Expectancy Theory | Job Embeddedness Theory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Herzberg Theory | 1 | -0.171 | -0.152 | -0.223 |
| Employee Equity Model | -0.171 | 1 | 0.097 | 0.036 |
| Expectancy Theory | -0.152 | 0.097 | 1 | 0.115 |
| Job Embeddedness Theory | -0.223 | 0.036 | 0.115 | 1 |

The table shows a correlation matrix between Herzberg Theory, Employee Equity Model, Expectancy Theory, and Job Embeddedness Theory. The Pearson correlation coefficients in the table show the strength and direction of these theories' links. The Herzberg Theory and the other three hypotheses are adversely related, as seen by their negative correlation. Herzberg's Theory has a -0.171 association with

the Employee Equity Model, -0.152 with the Expectancy Theory, and -0.223 with the Job Embeddedness Theory. This shows that the Herzberg hypothesis becomes less relevant when explaining the same facts as one hypothesis becomes more prominent. Other theories have positive relationships. The Employee Equity Model and Expectancy Theory have a 0.097 positive association, while the Expectancy Theory and Job Embeddedness Theory have 0.115. These good connections suggest that these ideas together explain or supplement the phenomenon being researched. The table shows that the Herzberg Theory has a negative association with the other hypotheses, while some have positive correlations, suggesting explanatory power complementarity. Correlations reveal how theoretical frameworks interact to explain the phenomenon.

## Discussion of the Major Findings

Herzberg deconstructs occupational happiness. It emphasizes career development, accountability, and success. This hypothesis suggests that job happiness and employer loyalty depend on these criteria. This hypothesis regards more pay as a "hygiene factor," which can make a person unhappy but not happier than career advancement and fascinating work. Our analysis shows that employees are content with their incomes but apprehensive about their careers. Career advancement needed to be improved, they said. We also examined the Job Embeddedness Model. JE evaluates job fit and workplace integration. This indicates how strongly the employee's personal and professional lives are tied and the projected social penalty of leaving in a coworker breakup. It also affects family job engagement. This approach passed our Person-Organisation fit test, but employees didn't like it. When the cost of leaving the business was also five, there was no significant social penalty for resigning; therefore, the employee may go for that reason, validating the thesis. No mean score was below 5 for coworker interactions. Employees thought they had good coworkers when others left. This contradicts the Herzberg theory; hence, the hypothesis has a higher aggregate mean.

According to expectation theory, the investigated company had no instrumentality difficulties. Workers' performance confidence averaged 7.74. Management was explicit about job duties and helpful, they said. Expectancy theory's instrumentality didn't affect employee turnover. The Theory worked as planned. Staff were strained by high labor quantity and quality expectations. Valence was equally important and applicable in our Theory. They thought their gift needed to be more significant for work. The Employee Equity Model improved (lower mean) with JE and P-O fit inquiries because EEM retention equity equals P-O fit. Organizational branding was straightforward and high in the employee equity concept. Value equity wasn't a concern, and employees felt paid competitively. Remarks stated that examiners loved their pay. Survey respondents indicated market-appropriate earnings at 63%. The economy harms job-hopping, say 55%. 75% chose not to apply for other jobs. Employee age and job-seeking were linked. Aging employees strengthened the relationship. In the table below, 30–39-year-old workers were more likely to explore outside choices.

**Table 8** Cross-tabulation: Age * Goal to switch roles in the Workplace * Years of experience as an employee

| How long have you been working as an examiner | I often think about changing my role (Binned) | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Less than one year | 30 - 39 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| | 40 - 45 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 - 3 years | 22 - 29 years | 0 | 1 | 10 | 11 |
| | 30 - 39 years | 2 | 1 | 10 | 13 |
| | 40 - 45 years | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Over 45 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 2 | 2 | 21 | 25 |
| 3 - 6 years | 22 - 29 years | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 |
| | 30 - 39 years | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| | Over 45 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 2 | 1 | 12 | 15 |
| More than six years | 22 - 29 years | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| | 30 - 39 years | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |

The table shows two survey questions cross-tabulated. For "How long have you been working as an examiner?" and "I often think about changing my role (Binned)," scores are "Disagree," "Undecided,"

and "Agree." A total of two responses were given in the "Less than one-year" category, which includes examiners aged 30 to 39. One was against it, and one was unsure. No 40–45-year-old responder suited this criterion. Individuals with "1 - 3 years" experience respond across age ranges. One 22–29-year-old supports this, while ten others are undecided. Two persons disagree one is unclear, and ten agree in the 30–39 age group. One 40-45-year-old agrees. None of these respondents are over 45. This group received 25 responses. One disagrees, six are undecided, and twelve concur in the "3 - 6 years" category, which includes examiners aged 22–29 and 30–39. "3 - 6 years" contains 22-29 and 30-39-year-old examiners. Finally, 22–29 and 30–39-year-olds respond to "More than six years" of experience. Four responders agree 22–29 years old, but only two at 30–39. This category received six answers. The table shows how examiners' views on changing responsibilities differ by age and experience. It offers intriguing insights into the relationship between experience, age, and the likelihood of considering shifting roles in this survey group. The data reveals that most examiners with less than a year of experience do not consider moving roles. Most examiners who have worked for more than a year consider driving jobs. This shows that longer-serving examiners are more inclined to consider switching roles. The table 8 also demonstrates that different age groups of employees are more likely to consider shifting roles. Employees aged 22–29 are more likely to consider changing roles than those aged 30-39. Younger workers may be more dissatisfied with their occupations than older workers. The table shows that examiners are likelier to consider shifting roles the longer they work. This applies especially to younger workers. Many preferred fascinating and challenging work to higher pay. Creative and cognitively engaging work was wanted by 49%. Overall, 51% found their job enjoyable. Most respondents prioritized career over money. They valued advancement above pay. About 53% wanted cross-departmental, higher-level jobs. They thought the company couldn't grow. 39% of respondents loved company growth for staying. (43%), employees disliked company learning opportunities. 45% said the firm will hinder their career goals. A majority of respondents (89%) felt competent in their occupations. Most responders felt capable yet overworked. Most (64%) of examiners thought they had more targets and less time. The majority (60%) also thought task units did not reflect effort. According to respondents, they were unhappy with their work acknowledgment. Many (49%) respondents felt their work was unfairly noted. They also thought the product quality review system could have been better designed, indicating dissatisfaction with their achievement. The bonus and reward structure dissatisfied most examiners. Sixty-three percent thought the incentive system needed to reflect their work.

## 4. Conclusion

For employees polled, careers are the top priority. This is the primary reason workers think about taking jobs outside the company. If sufficient prospects for professional advancement are offered, many employees seem eager to remain with the company. Most of them want a more prosperous and advanced profession. On the other hand, a respectable portion of workers consider their jobs tedious and uninteresting. They also feel the organization is stale and does not provide enough learning opportunities. As a result, people seem inclined to quit if they can work at a more mentally challenging job that fits their interests. The workload seems to be another factor. Examiners generally appear anxious about their jobs. They frequently feel pressured to complete tasks quickly and think they should be able to do more in less time. An intriguing finding from the survey is that workers believe their jobs are fascinating by nature. But the pressure to finish it quickly could turn it into a tedious task.

There also is a problem with motivation. Workers are not thrilled that their hard work needs to be acknowledged. The workers are content with their pay. They are satisfied with their work environment and non-cash benefits. Therefore, financial stimulation isn't an issue. Concerns regarding the lack of communication between management and staff are not warranted. Workers also have a strong sense of pride in their company and a propensity to believe that society values what they do.

### Recommendations

One of the main reasons for employee turnover in an organization is a need for more opportunities for professional advancement. Lack of career advancement is why workers in their 30s are likelier to leave their jobs than others. Opportunities for learning and career advancement are essential for keeping employees on board. While offering sufficient advancement prospects will help retain people, if an organization does not attempt to engage its employees and provide them with creative activities cognitively, some employees will still hunt for other employment. This could also mean that an employee's retention is influenced by their decision about their fit as a PO. When market conditions are advantageous, an employee with career ambitions that conflict with the company's will not be encouraged to continue on staff and will depart. Financial rewards are one of many ways to keep employees on staff. Parts of employee motivation that are crucial are creativity and mental satisfaction.

Even if the work itself might be fascinating, deadline pressure has the potential to eliminate creativity and make it dull and procedural. Thus, striking a balance between creativity and production is essential. An excessive focus on production might make work more varied and exciting, eventually leading to staff turnover and job discontent.

**References:**

1. J. W. Han, "A review of antecedents of employee turnover in the hospitality industry on individual, team and organizational levels," International Hospitality Review, vol. 36, no. 1, 2022, doi: 10.1108/ihr-09-2020-0050.
2. R. Jain and A. Nayyar, "Predicting employee attrition using xgboost machine learning approach," in Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on System Modeling and Advancement in Research Trends, SMART 2018, 2018. doi: 10.1109/SYSMART.2018.8746940.
3. Evy Rombaut and Marie-Anne Guerry, "Predicting voluntary turnover through human resources database analysis," Management Research Review , vol. Vol. 41, no. No. 1, pp. 96–112, 2018.
4. J. Frierson and D. Si, "Who's next: Evaluating attrition with machine learning algorithms and survival analysis," in Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics), 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-94301-5_19.
5. N. Khalifa, M. Alnasheet, and H. Kadhem, "Evaluating Machine Learning Algorithms to Detect Employees' Attrition," in 2022 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Robotics and Control, AIRC 2022, 2022. doi: 10.1109/AIRC56195.2022.9836981.
6. A. C. M. I. G. P. Alrence Santiago Halibas, "Determining the Intervening Effects of Exploratory Data Analysis and Feature Engineering in Telecoms Customer Churn Modelling," in {2019 4th MEC International Conference on Big Data and Smart City (ICBDSC), 2019, pp. 1–7.
7. K. Coussement, S. Lessmann, and G. Verstraeten, "A comparative analysis of data preparation algorithms for customer churn prediction: A case study in the telecommunication industry," Decis Support Syst, vol. 95, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2016.11.007.
8. D. Chung, J. Yun, J. Lee, and Y. Jeon, "Predictive model of employee attrition based on stacking ensemble learning," Expert Syst Appl, vol. 215, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2022.119364.
9. G. Gabrani and A. Kwatra, "Machine learning based predictive model for risk assessment of employee attrition," in Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics), 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-95171-3_16.
10. A. Raza, K. Munir, M. Almutairi, F. Younas, and M. M. S. Fareed, "Predicting Employee Attrition Using Machine Learning Approaches," Applied Sciences (Switzerland), vol. 12, no. 13, 2022, doi: 10.3390/app12136424.
11. F. Fallucchi, M. Coladangelo, R. Giuliano, and E. W. De Luca, "Predicting employee attrition using machine learning techniques," Computers, vol. 9, no. 4, 2020, doi: 10.3390/computers9040086.
12. M. Singh et al., "An analytics approach for proactively combating voluntary attrition of employees," in Proceedings - 12th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops, ICDMW 2012, 2012. doi: 10.1109/ICDMW.2012.136.
13. P. R. Srivastava and P. Eachempati, "Intelligent Employee Retention System for Attrition Rate Analysis and Churn Prediction: An Ensemble Machine Learning and Multi- Criteria Decision-Making Approach," Journal of Global Information Management, vol. 29, no. 6, 2021, doi: 10.4018/JGIM.20211101.oa23.
14. D. K. Srivastava and P. Nair, "Employee attrition analysis using predictive techniques," in Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-63673-3_35.
15. S. Singh, S. Ganguli, and R. David, "Women workforce attrition dynamics in Indian IT/ITES sector," Qualitative Report, vol. 22, no. 5, 2017, doi: 10.46743/2160-3715/2017.2457.