Effect of Retention Management on Organizational Commitment with Employee Satisfaction as a Mediation Variable
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Abstract: This study aims to analyze the factors that affect Employee Organizational Commitment at the Human Resources Development Training Center-BPPK Ministry of Finance. The method used in this research is quantitative method with data analysis methods including validity test, reliability test and SmartPLS analysis. While the data collection method in this study used a questionnaire involving all staff of the PSDM-BPPK Ministry of Finance Education and Training. The results of this study prove that retention management has not had a significant direct effect on employee organizational commitment, but has a significant effect on organizational commitment and employee satisfaction as a mediating / intervening variable. Employee satisfaction itself has a direct and significant effect on employee organizational commitment.
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A healthy organization requires qualified, professional Human Resources and has a good level of organizational commitment. Human Resources in an organization is an important determining factor for the effectiveness of activities carrying out the duties and functions of an organization, including government institutions such as the Education and Training Center for Human Resources Development of the Ministry of Finance. The success of an employee’s performance in a field of duty is largely determined by the level of quality of competence and the level of satisfaction and comfort concerned in serving. Therefore, institutions or organizations are required to be able to improve the quality of their human resources and maintain the level of employee job satisfaction properly (Masum, Azad, & Beh, 2015). The absence of a management retention program at the BPPK HR Development Training Center can lead to low levels of organizational commitment and employee job satisfaction levels, which in turn are feared to increase the HRD Training Center employee turnover rate. The low level of organizational commitment of employees can increase the level of employee turnover which results in the level of organizational performance being not optimal (Batemen & Snelt, 2015).

Koch in Sopiah (2008)argued that the impact of low organizational commitment in terms of the organization is turnover, high absenteeism, increased work delays, lack of intensity to survive as employees in the organization. Jansen in Sopiah (2008)added that if employee commitment is low then it can trigger unfavorable employee behavior, for example riots whose further impact is a decline in the reputation of the organization, loss of trust, and a further impact is a decline in company profits or institutional performance.

Based on the results of document review and interviews conducted by the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Finance, it was found that there were no PSDM Education and Training Center
employees who resigned or quit at their own request from the PSDM Education and Training Center, which means the turnover rate is zero or low. However, to avoid or prevent the occurrence of many employees resigning or leaving the PPSDM at their own request, it is necessary to have HR management commonly referred to as employee retention management. With retention management, it is expected that HR management, both recruitment, competency development and job empowerment will be more effective and efficient.

The existence of good retention management can also give employees the flexibility to develop themselves professionally which can lead to employee job satisfaction. Terera and Ngirande (2014) in his research showed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee retention, which means that if they are more satisfied, they will remain in the organization and organizational commitment is well maintained. The same research was also carried out by Aydogdu and Asikgil (2011) in An Empirical Study of The Relationship Among Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. The impact of the implementation of retention management on employee organizational commitment is estimated to be more optimal if employee job satisfaction is well maintained in carrying out their duties so as to build a strong sense of belonging to the institution. Therefore, we need an academic study or research related to the role of employee retention management and professionalism, its effect on employee organizational commitment mediated by employee satisfaction in carrying out their duties within the BPPK PSDM Training Center environment.

METHOD

The population in this study were all employees of the PSDM-BPPK Training Center. Considering that the number of employees is not large, the sample in this study is the entire population/employees totaling 104 (one hundred and four) employees. Collecting data in this study using an instrumental questionnaire technique, namely through a questionnaire by providing a written statement that must be chosen by the respondent according to his own characteristics related to retention management, employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. The answer format of the questionnaire uses a list of statements and uses a measurement scale technique or commonly called a Likert Scale, thus the data obtained is interval data.

In this study, the data analysis methods used are: Descriptive analysis to describe the variables used in this study. Descriptive analysis of each research variable was carried out by presenting measures of centralization and distribution of data in the form of tables and graphs to get a visual picture of the research data.

Inferential statistical analysis, this analysis is used for hypothesis testing using path analysis or path analysis. Path analysis is an analytical method developed by an applied geneticist named Sewal Wright in 1934 and is used as a method to study the direct and indirect effects of a variable, where some variables are considered as causes and other variables are considered as effects. Path analysis is also known as causal modeling, because path analysis makes it possible to test theoretical proportions of causal relationships of certain variables. The model specifications and analysis of the research path used can be seen in Figure 1. Data processing used with the help of Smartpls 3 software.

Instrumental Testing

Testing of the main analysis requirements is carried out to ensure that the measuring instruments used are suitable for measurement (valid and reliable). Test done with SEM PLS (Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & Hopkins, 2014) starting with testing the measurement model (outer model) to test the construct validity and instrument reliability. The validity test was conducted to measure the ability of the research instrument to measure what it was supposed to measure. The construct validity test in the PLS indicator reflective model is carried out through a convergent validity test with a reference value of outer loading > 0.6, discriminant validity with the largest cross loading indicator reference in accordance with the latent variable and average variance extracted (AVE) with a reference value > 0.5 (Ghozali, 2014).
The reliability test is used to measure the consistency of the measuring instrument in measuring the concept or it can also be used to measure the consistency of the respondent in answering the instrument. The instrument is said to be reliable if a person’s answer to the statement is consistent or stable over time. The reliability test in PLS can use the composite reliability method and Cronbach’s alpha with a reference value of 0.7 each.

The structural model (inner model) is evaluated using R-square for the dependent variable and the path coefficient value for the independent variable which is then assessed for significance based on the t-statistic value of each path. In addition, the Stone-Geisser Q-square test is used for predictive relevance, which is to measure how well the observed value is generated by the model and its parameters. A Q-square value greater than 0 (zero) indicates that the model has predictive relevance, while a Q-square value less than 0 (zero) indicates that the model lacks predictive relevance. Evaluation of the goodness of fit (gof) model is measured using R2 dependent latent variable with the same interpretation as regression with a reference value of 0.38 (Ghozali, 2014).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Description

Characteristics of respondents broken down by gender indicate that the majority of respondents are male. The percentage of male respondents was 63.43 percent or 111 respondents, while female respondents were 36.57 percent or 64 respondents. In general, the selected respondents are in the young age category. This can be seen from the composition of the selected respondents, which is only 6.17 percent aged 50 years and over. While the majority of respondents aged between 30 to 39 years, namely 43 percent, followed by respondents aged under 30 years at 36.69 and respondents aged between 40 to 49 years at 13.96 percent.

The characteristics of the respondents who were selected as samples, most or 72.1 percent were executive employees or staff with a total of 75 employees, while the percentage of respondents who had the status of echelon 4 officials was the second largest with a total of 13 employees which was equivalent to 12.5 percent, followed by Functional Widyaiswara as many as 12 people or 11.5 percent and the least is echelon 3 officials at 3.8 percent or as many as 4 respondents. If it is broken down based on the highest education completed, it shows that the majority of respondents have S1 or undergraduate education as many as 39 employees or 37.5 percent, followed by the second most are Masters with 32 employees or 30.8 percent, then followed by D1 as many as 28 employees or 26.9 percent. and at least is a Bachelor or D3 as many as 4.
Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents

| Variable       | Category                  | Amount | Percentage |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------|------------|
| Gender         | Man                       | 67     | 64.4       |
|                | girl                      | 37     | 35.6       |
|                | up to 35 years old        | 69     | 66.3       |
| Age            | 36 -40 years old          | 7      | 6.7        |
|                | over the age of 41        | 32     | 30.8       |
| Position       | Echelon III               | 4      | 3.8        |
|                | Echelon IV                | 13     | 12.5       |
|                | WI Functional             | 12     | 11.5       |
|                | Executor                  | 75     | 72.1       |
|                | high school               | 5      | 4.8        |
| Education      | IN                        | 28     | 26.9       |
| Last           | S1                        | 39     | 37.5       |
|                | S2                        | 32     | 30.8       |
|                | up to 20 years-20         | 73     | 70.2       |
| Years of service | 21-30 years old           | 23     | 22.1       |
|                | 31 years and over         | 8      | 7.7        |
| Total          |                           | 104    | 100.0      |

The characteristics of the respondents who were selected as samples, most or 72.1 percent were executive employees or staff with a total of 75 employees, while the percentage of respondents who had the status of echelon 4 officials was the second largest with a total of 13 employees which was equivalent to 12.5 percent, followed by Functional Widyaiswara as many as 12 people or 11.5 percent and the least is echelon 3 officials at 3.8 percent or as many as 4 respondents. If it is broken down based on the highest education completed, it shows that the majority of respondents have S1 or undergraduate education as many as 39 employees or 37.5 percent, followed by the second most are Masters with 32 employees or 30.8 percent, then followed by D1 as many as 28 employees or 26.9 percent. and at least is a Bachelor or D3 as many as 4.

Respondents who were selected in terms of years of service for most of the categories of tenure up to 20 years were 73 employees or 70.2 percent. Then the second largest are employees with a working period of 21-30 years as many as 23 employees or 22.1 percent and the lowest is employees with a service period of 31 years and above as many as 8 people or 7.7 percent.

Instrumental Test Results

Based on the initial outer loading test, there are several indicators whose outer values are below 0.6 (invalid), namely Satisfaction01, Satisfaction02, Satisfaction03 and Satisfaction04 on the Satisfaction variable, Management06 on the Management Variable and Commitment02, Commitment07, Commitment10, Commitment11, Commitment12, Commitment13, Commitment14, Commitment16, Commitment17, Commitment18, and Commitment19 on the Commitment variable so that the indicator is removed from the model and retested by issuing invalid indicators, with the results shown in Table 2.
Table 2. Outer Model Test Results

| Satisfaction Employee | loading | Commitment Organization | loading | Management Retention | loading |
|------------------------|---------|--------------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|
| Satisfaction 01        | 0.648   | Commitment 01            | 0.684   | Management 01        | 0.725   |
| Satisfaction 02        | 0.756   | Commitment 03            | 0.823   | Management 02        | 0.721   |
| Satisfaction 03        | 0.615   | Commitment 04            | 0.818   | Management 03        | 0.640   |
| Satisfaction 04        | 0.721   | Commitment 05            | 0.710   | Management 04        | 0.701   |
| Satisfaction 05        | 0.807   | Commitment 06            | 0.732   | Management 05        | 0.731   |
| Satisfaction 06        | 0.720   | Commitment 07            | 0.703   | Management 07        | 0.678   |
|                        |         | Commitment 08            | 0.560   | Management 08        | 0.728   |
|                        |         | Commitment 09            | 0.741   | Management 09        | 0.754   |
|                        |         | Commitment 10            |         | Management 10        | 0.689   |

From the results above, it can be seen that all indicators are above 0.6 (valid) so that it can be continued with other tests. One of them is the discriminant validity value, namely the value of the crossloading indicator according to the variable. From the results in Table 3, it can be seen that the largest crossloading value of all indicators is in accordance with the latent variable/construct.

Table 3. Cross Loading Value

| Indicator     | Satisfaction Employee | Commitment Organization | Management Retention |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Satisfaction 01| 0.648                 | 0.428                   | 0.486                |
| Satisfaction 02| 0.756                 | 0.458                   | 0.587                |
| Satisfaction 03| 0.615                 | 0.502                   | 0.340                |
| Satisfaction 04| 0.721                 | 0.379                   | 0.586                |
| Satisfaction 05| 0.807                 | 0.550                   | 0.668                |
| Satisfaction 06| 0.720                 | 0.389                   | 0.586                |
| Commitment 01  | 0.432                 | 0.684                   | 0.348                |
| Commitment 03  | 0.560                 | 0.823                   | 0.361                |
| Commitment 04  | 0.508                 | 0.818                   | 0.339                |
| Commitment 05  | 0.496                 | 0.710                   | 0.352                |
| Commitment 06  | 0.360                 | 0.732                   | 0.334                |
| Commitment 08  | 0.393                 | 0.703                   | 0.332                |
| Commitment 09  | 0.343                 | 0.560                   | 0.237                |
| Commitment 10  | 0.505                 | 0.741                   | 0.426                |
| Management 01  | 0.544                 | 0.433                   | 0.725                |
| Management 02  | 0.524                 | 0.385                   | 0.721                |
| Management 03  | 0.442                 | 0.144                   | 0.640                |
| Management 04  | 0.548                 | 0.284                   | 0.701                |
| Management 05  | 0.545                 | 0.347                   | 0.731                |
| Management 07  | 0.529                 | 0.298                   | 0.678                |
| Management 08  | 0.630                 | 0.377                   | 0.728                |
| Management 09  | 0.629                 | 0.368                   | 0.754                |
| Management 10  | 0.482                 | 0.316                   | 0.689                |

In addition to looking at the value of outer loading and discriminant validity, another way to see the simultaneous validity of an indicator in a divine latent variable is by looking at the AVE value of each variable. In Table 4 it can be seen that the AVE value is above 0.5, this means that all latent variables used in this study are valid because they have met the recommended AVE value (> 0.5).
Table 4. Latent Variable AVE Value

| Variable                  | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Employee Satisfaction    | 0.510                            |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.527                            |
| Retention Management     | 0.502                            |

Furthermore, the construct reliability test was also carried out as measured by composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha. Table 5. shows that all constructs have composite reliability values above 0.70 and Cronbach’s alpha above 0.70. So it can be concluded that the construct has good reliability.

Table 5. Value of Composite Reliability and Cronbach Alpha

|                        | Cronbach’s Alpha | Composite Reliability |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Employee Satisfaction  | 0.806             | 0.861                 |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.871             | 0.898                 |
| Retention Management   | 0.876             | 0.900                 |

The structural model is evaluated by using R-square for the dependent variable and the path coefficient value for the independent variable which is then assessed for significance based on the t-statistic value of each path. In Table 6 there are two values of R2 based on the path in the model studied. The first R2 value of 0.590 means that the independent variable (management resistance) is able to explain the mediating/intervening variable (organizational commitment) for the remaining 59 percent by other variables outside the model. While the second R2 of 0.387 means that the independent variable (Resistant Management) and the mediating/intervening variable (employee satisfaction) are able to explain the dependent variable (organizational commitment) of 38.7 percent, the remaining by other variables outside the model. In addition, the value of Q2 is 0.748 and gof is 0.

Table 6. R Square and R Square Adjusted

| Variable                  | R Square | R Square Adjusted |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Employee Satisfaction    | 0.594    | 0.590             |
| Organizational Commitment | 0.399    | 0.387             |

The next step is to test the hypothesis. This test is carried out by comparing the resulting t-statistical value with the t-table value based on the specified alpha value, which is 5 percent. A variable is considered significant if the value of t statistic is greater than 1.64. In addition to comparing the t-statistical value with the t-table, the effect of a variable can be seen by comparing the prob.value with the specified alpha. A variable is considered significant if the value of prob.value is less than negligible. The results of the hypotheses test can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Hypothesis testing

| Relationship/Influence Between Variables | Original Sample(O) | T Statistics ((O/STDEV)) | P Values | Decision   | Conclusion           |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------|------------|----------------------|
| Employee Satisfactionà Organizational Commitment | 0.656              | 5.872                    | 0.000    | reject Ho  | significant direct effect |
| Retention Managementà Employee Satisfaction | 0.771              | 9.770                    | 0.000    | reject Ho  | significant direct effect |
| Retention Managementà Organizational Commitment | -0.031             | 0.265                    | 0.791    | don’t refuse Ho | no direct effect |
| Retention Managementà Employee Satisfaction | 0.505              | 5.581                    | 0.000    | reject Ho  | significant indirect effect |
Regression equation:
Employee Satisfaction = 0.771 Retention Management
Organizational Commitment = 0.031 Retention Management + 0.656 Employee Satisfaction

Based on the results in Figure 2 and Table 7, the following results are obtained:
Retention Management yet direct and not significant effect on Organizational Commitment with a coefficient of -0.031 with the value of t stat = -0.265 < t table = 1.64 and prob. value = 0.791 > alpha = 0.05. This means that there is not enough evidence that retention management has a direct effect on organizational commitment, it can also be said that the presence or absence of retention management does not affect the quality of organizational commitment from employees with the assumption that other variables are constant.

Retention Management a direct and significant positive effect on Employee Satisfaction with a coefficient of 0.771 with the value of t stat = 9.770 > t table = 1.64 and prob. value = 0.000 < alpha = 0.05. This means that an increase of 1 point in retention management will increase employee satisfaction by 0.771 points with the assumption that other variables are constant.

Employee Satisfaction a direct and significant positive effect on Organizational Commitment with a coefficient of 0.656 with the value of t stat = 5.872 > t table = 1.64 and prob. value = 0.000 < alpha = 0.05. Because the coefficient is positive, it indicates a unidirectional relationship. This means that the better the level of employee satisfaction, the better the organizational commitment of employees. An increase of 1 point in employee satisfaction will increase commitment by 0.656 points with the assumption that other variables are constant.

Retention Management has an indirect and significant positive effect on Organizational Commitment through satisfaction with coefficient of 0.505 with t stat = 5.581 > t table and prob. value = 0.000 < alpha = 0.05. This means that an increase of 1 point in retention management will increase commitment indirectly through employee satisfaction as a mediating/intervening variable by 0.505 points with the assumption that other variables are constant. Because it has a direct effect only if it is carried out by mediation, this mediation is referred to as complete mediation (complete mediation).

**Effect of Retention Management on Organizational Commitment**

This study found that Retention Management has not direct and not significant effect on Organizational Commitment. This means that there is not enough evidence that retention management has a direct effect on organizational commitment, it can also be said that the presence or absence of retention management does not affect the quality of organizational commitment from employees with the assumption that other variables are constant. This means that in any government agency or institution, when an agency leader only relies on the implementation of modest retention management in managing its human resources, it will not be able to guarantee the quality of its employees’ organizational commitment at the level required by an organization in order to have an effect on improving performance. employees and organizational performance.

Subordinates or employees are human beings who need a touch of emotional intelligence such as attention and empathy from agency leaders, fair treatment, application of good organizational culture, guarantee of employee satisfaction in career development and provision of adequate facilities. So that raises employees who have integrity and loyalty as well as a high sense of belonging to the organization. The most important thing that needs to be done by an agency leader is to continuously learn from experience and always monitor and evaluate the implementation of effective retention management that is able to create a work climate that is conducive to the environment.

This is in line with the opinion of Mathis and Jackson (2008) which states that the retention management program is the implementation of policies, practices, and Human Resources management systems to maintain employees to always have high performance and continue to work within the
organization. Empirical studies conducted by Zajac in Sopiah (2008) argued that the impact of high organizational commitment is that employees will remain in the organization and be more satisfied in their lives as a whole. Therefore, the existence of good Retention Management in PPSDM should receive serious attention from the leadership of the agency, if the success of the implementation of Employee Retention Management in PPSDM is proven, it can be offered to be replicated in other agencies within the scope of the Ministry of Finance.

**Effect of Retention Management on Employee Satisfaction**

This study found that treatment and communication with fellow co-workers were well established and there was a feeling of mutual trust between employees with sincerity, PPSDM had a good work culture, had the highest value in contributing to employee satisfaction, this indicates the components of this study found that Management Retention has an effect on Employee Satisfaction. The positive sign of the coefficient indicates a unidirectional relationship. This means that the better retention management will result in better employee satisfaction, the implementation of good and appropriate retention management, able to maintain and even increase the satisfaction of PPSDM employees so as to minimize the desire of employees to leave PPSDM as a result of feeling dissatisfied, either leaving as PNS Ministry of Finance or not. He left because he asked to be transferred to another unit outside the PPSDM. Serious attention and empathy by the leadership is needed to realize and implement retention management properly.

This is in line with research by Terera and Ngirande (2014) which states there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee retention, which means that the more satisfied they are, they will remain in the organization and organizational commitment is well maintained.

**The effect of employee satisfaction on organizational commitment**

This study found that employee satisfaction has an effect on organizational commitment. This means that the better employee satisfaction, resulting in better organizational commitment owned by employees in order to encourage the achievement of optimal performance both as individuals and as PPSDM organizations, minimize the desire of employees to leave the PPSDM as a result of feeling dissatisfied. This is in line with research Colquitt et al., (2015) which states, the manifestation of what is felt about work and about what is thought at work. Employees who have high job satisfaction will always get positive feelings about their work when they think about their work or participate in their activities. Thus he will have the desire to repeat these positive feelings. On the other hand, employees with low levels of job satisfaction have negative feelings in thinking about and when participating in carrying out their work duties so that they have a great tendency to choose to leave their jobs.

**Employee Satisfaction Mediates the Effect of Retention Management on Organizational Commitment**

Employee Satisfaction mediates the effect of Retention Management on Employee Commitment. Given the positive sign coefficient indicates that the higher the retention management will result in higher employee commitment, if mediated by employee satisfaction which is also higher. Thus, Employee Satisfaction serves as a mediating variable for the relationship between Retention Management and Employee Commitment and the type of mediation is pure mediation.

**Implications of Research Results**

Theoretical Implications, This study provides empirical evidence that retention management as a driver of organizational commitment is mediated by employee satisfaction. The results of this study complement the concept of research results Torrington in Cahyani (2009), who said, there are five kinds of employee retention strategies, namely compensation, fulfillment of expectations, induction, HR practices that pay attention to employees' families, and training and development, but these five things do not automatically retain employees.

This study succeeded in comprehensively testing the relationship between Retention Management on Employee Satisfaction and its impact on Organizational Commitment, simultaneously. This
comprehensive systems approach is the development of several previous research results, namely research conducted by Sharma and Pooja. (2017), Barbara Bigliardi et al. (2012), Terera and Ngirande (2014).

**Practical Implications**

This study results that with good and appropriate retention management will be able to increase employee satisfaction, so that directly or indirectly can increase employee organizational commitment. This can be used as a perspective to transform employee development in PPSDM. Other practical implications of the results of this study can also be implemented for agencies that have characteristics such as PPSDM.

The model of the results of this study is related to HR management, especially regarding Retention Management and Employee Satisfaction, then the effects and impacts on Organizational Commitment are a more comprehensive development concept. This can be used to review HR management policies in order to improve the Performance of PPSDM Employees and Agencies.

**CONCLUSION**

The results of this study prove that Retention Management has not had a direct significant effect on Employee Organizational Commitment, but has a significant effect on Organizational Commitment with Employee Satisfaction as a mediating/intervening variable. Employee satisfaction itself has a direct and significant effect on employee organizational commitment. Retention Management is needed to increase the Organizational Commitment of PPSDM employees, but the success of the implementation of Retention Management depends on the extent to which the leadership can ensure the realization of employee satisfaction in carrying out their duties, fostering careers and maintaining their welfare. The better retention management, will result in better employee satisfaction, implementation of good and appropriate retention management, able to maintain and even increase the satisfaction of PPSDM employees so as to minimize the desire of employees to leave PPSDM as a result of feeling dissatisfied, either leaving as civil servants at the Ministry of Finance or leaving because of the desire to be transferred to other units outside PPSDM. Serious attention and empathy from the leadership is needed to realize and implement retention management properly.

Based on the results of the research that has been done, some suggestions that can be recommended are to realize the role of Retention Management, considering that this variable has a significant effect on employee satisfaction. In addition, a strong leadership role is needed to ensure that retention management is carried out with full responsibility so that employee satisfaction increases, is able to better realize organizational commitment, as a factor that affects employee performance and agency performance, through various trainings to increase employee competency capacity from aspects soft competence. And can develop models or research methods so that results are obtained that can better explain the phenomena studied.
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