

## **Employee Turnover Intent as a Predictor of Organizational Effectiveness - An Empirical Study**

**Dr. G. Hima Bindu, Assistant Professor – HR & OB,**  
Amity Global Business School, Hyderabad. +91 9490746451, [hbpedaprolu@hyd.amity.edu](mailto:hbpedaprolu@hyd.amity.edu)

**Ms. Aarathi V, Manager – HR and Admin.,**  
Saheli Estates, Hyderabad. +91 9989344767, [v.aarathi97@gmail.com](mailto:v.aarathi97@gmail.com)

### **Abstract:**

Employee turnover intent is a step prior to the actual turnover, it is the relative propensity of a member's intent towards voluntary and permanent exit from the organization. Organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization attains its short-term and long-term goals effectively and efficiently.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the impact of employee turnover intentions on organizational effectiveness dimensions viz., Problem Solving capability, Collaborative decision making, Morale & Commitment and Goal optimization. The study was carried out with specific reference to the employees of select IT (Information Technology) organizations based in Hyderabad, India. The data was subjected to correlation analysis between turnover intentions as independent variable and each of the four dimensions of organizational effectiveness as dependent variables. Additionally the variables were subjected to linear regression analysis. The results establish that the turnover intentions are significant predictors of organizational effectiveness dimensions.

**Key Words:** Turnover Intentions, Organizational Effectiveness, Goal Optimization, Collaborative Decision Making.

### **Introduction:**

Information technology (IT) organizations in India have experienced a significantly high voluntary employee turnover during the past few years, employees in general switch from one organization to another for several reasons. Managers across the globe readily agree with the fact that retention of employees significantly results in higher satisfaction of the customers, enhanced quality of products and services and considerable improvement in organizational effectiveness. Research studies on employee turnover across the globe indicate that voluntary turnover of employees can be harsh because of the negative organizational outcomes associated with it. Diminished organizational effectiveness is one such negative outcome.

An employee's intention to quit or continue in the organization has been an interesting topic for both managers and researchers alike. There has been a lot of literature pertaining to employee turnover in the field of organizational behavior, particularly in connection with organizational effectiveness.

With increased competition because of globalization, organizations must continue to develop superior products and provide services which are based on strategies created by employees, such employees are very much critical to the success of the organization and value of such employees cannot be easily replicated (**Meaghan et al., 2002**). Managers must recognize that employees are major contributors to the effective and efficient achievement of the organization's goals (**Abbasi et al., 2000**).

Studies on voluntary turnover identified that turnover is one of the significant reasons for financial loss to the organization. They also recommended that employee turnover is a terrible and an expensive affair, it decreases effectiveness of the organizations and productivity of the employees to a greater degree.

This paper attempts to examine the impact of employee turnover intent on organizational effectiveness dimensions.

### **Review of Literature:**

In this context it is important to understand the available literature and theoretical background pertaining to employee turnover intentions and organizational effectiveness.

#### **What is voluntary Turnover ?**

There are a many different types of employee turnover described in the literature. Irrespective of the type of turnover, all are generally associated with negative effects. These negative effects can be in terms of extra costs or disruption to the normal functioning of the organization or decreased organizational performance. Voluntary turnover is expressed as an unplanned loss of employees, who quit on their own and whom employers would prefer to retain (**Frank, Finnegan & Taylor, 2004**). Voluntary turnover can be either unavoidable or avoidable. The former happens in unavoidable circumstances like the death or disablement of an employee and the latter can be avoided / prevented as it involves change of job or early retirement. (**Iqbal, 2010**). The latter type of turnover is the focus of this paper.

According to **Wright and Bonett (2007)**, Turnover can be sub divided into voluntary and involuntary turnover. Voluntary turnover happens when members intends to quit and ultimately decides to quit. As mentioned above, it is the type of quitting that all the managers are interested in and it would have a detrimental effect on the organization. On the contrary, involuntary turnover could be, an employee is asked to leave the organization for the reasons such as layoff or low job performance.

#### **What is turnover intent?**

**Hom and Grifeth (1991)** explained employee turnover intent as the strength of an individual's intent toward voluntary and permanent withdrawal from an organization.

**Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) in their study examined that** that a member's intent to quit can affect the decisions of voluntary turnover in a dual way. It may lead directly to it even when there are no employment opportunities readily available or it may influence an employee to search for new job opportunities, thus resulting in withdrawal.

**Schwepker (2001) explained that** there exists a positive and statistically significant relationship between turnover intent and actual turnover behavior. In other words, intention to leave a job is an immediate precursor to actual leaving. For this reason, employee intent to quit has been included into most employee turnover models in the literature.

Intention to quit is not essentially the act of leaving the organization but it is only a thought or feeling of quitting. It is actually one step prior to the act of quitting, which is planning to leave. In contrast, actual turnover is the employee's permanent withdrawal from the organization (**Chen et al., 2010**). Chen in his study indicated that the employees quitting the organization is best predicted by the intentions to leave.

#### **What is organizational effectiveness ?**

Organizational effectiveness can be explained as the extent to which a firm accomplishes its goals. Effectiveness of a firm is also depicted in terms of its survival. An organization's effectiveness can also be seen in the way it uses its resources in an efficient manner and continues to contribute to a larger system.

OE refers to strategies and tactics that encourage the improvement of the organization so that it can meet its purpose and fully realize its potential and maximize its ability to make

significant and long lasting contributions to its constituencies. Practically speaking, most of the definitions are based either on goal approach or on system approach or sometimes a combination of both. **Cunnings** views that effectiveness of an organization is the degree to which it is instrumental for its members. In this viewpoint effectiveness is seen at the individual level rather than the organizational level. **Pennings and Goodman** opined that organizations are effective as long as they are able to achieve desired goals while trying to satisfy the certain conditions while conforming certain standards against which outcomes are evaluated.

### **Research Gap and Need for the Study**

Despite the fact that there are number of turnover studies surveyed across the world, the problem of turnover intentions has not been studied in depth. Though literature has identified several factors that significantly add to turnover intentions and also the resultant negative outcomes, turnover intent has not been studied in depth in light of an important outcome such as organizational effectiveness. So the present study focused on this area.

There is a need to test whether employee intentions to quit has a bearing on organizational effectiveness and does it apply in case of select organizations belonging to IT sector of Hyderabad city, India in current time context.

### **Research Questions**

From the above section it is clear that the study reduces to the following set of questions:

1. Does employee turnover intent impact organisational effectiveness dimensions?
2. If it does impact, Is there any evidence?
3. Can it be measured empirically?

### **Variables under the Study**

1. Turnover Intentions.
2. Organizational effectiveness dimensions as perceived by employees viz.,
  - Problem Solving Capability
  - Collaborative Decision Making
  - Morale and Commitment
  - Goal Optimization.

### **Objectives of the Study**

After considering the above research questions and variables relevant for the study the following objectives are arrived at:

1. To analyse the impact of turnover intentions on organisational effectiveness dimensions
2. To recommend ways and means to enhance organizational effectiveness

### **Hypotheses**

#### **The Hypotheses tested under this study are as follows**

H<sub>0</sub>1 : There is no statistically significant association between turnover intentions and perceived problem solving capability.

Ha1: There is statistically significant association between turnover intentions and perceived problem solving capability.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There is no statistically significant association between turnover intentions and collaborative decision making.

Ha2 : There is statistically significant association between turnover intentions and collaborative decision making.

H<sub>0</sub> 3 : There is no statistically significant relationship between turnover intentions and Morale & commitment.

Ha3 : There is statistically significant relationship between turnover intentions and Morale & commitment.

H<sub>0</sub> 4 : There is no statistically significant association between turnover intentions and Goal optimization.

Ha4 : There is statistically significant association between turnover intentions and Goal optimization.

### **Measuring Instruments**

Measuring instruments were adapted from established scales widely used in literature whose construct validity stands tested. Following are the scales used for the variables under study.

- ▶ **Turnover Intentions (Intent to Quit)** was measured via a structured 12 itemed questionnaire based on Martin and Shore model of turnover intentions, on a five point Likert scale with point anchors ranging from “1” Strongly disagree to “5” Strongly agree.
- ▶ **Organizational Effectiveness** was measured via a 20 itemed questionnaire developed based on Campbell model of organizational effectiveness on a five point Likert scale with point anchors ranging from “1” Strongly disagree to “5” Strongly agree. The questionnaire measures organizational effectiveness dimensions viz., Problem Solving capability, Collaborative decision making, Morale & Commitment and Goal optimization.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The study is not free from limitations. The limitations of the study are as under:

1. The study was limited to IT sector organisations of the Hyderabad city of Telangana State. Although there is much more area that can be covered.
2. There may be response bias.
3. Time and other resource constraints restricted the selection of more number of respondents.

## **Data Analysis and Results**

### **1. Reliability Measures**

**Table 1: Summarized Results of Measures of Reliability**

S. No.	Measures	No. of items	Chronbach's Alpha
1	Turnover intentions	12	0.842
2	Organizational Effectiveness dimensions	20	0.821

### **2. Correlation Analysis**

Results of Correlation Analysis between turnover intentions and each of the four dimensions of organizational effectiveness are tabulated below.

**Table 2: Summarized Results of Correlation Analysis**

S. No.	Variables considered for Correlation Analysis	Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation Value (r)	Inference Drawn
1	Turnover Intentions Vs Problem Solving Capability	-0.714	Negative & Strong
2	Turnover Intentions Vs Collaborative decision making	-0.687	Negative & Strong

3	Turnover Intentions Vs Morale & Commitment	-0.672	Negative & Strong
4	Turnover Intentions Vs Goal Optimization	-0.724	Negative & Strong

*Source: Primary data*

### 3. Regression Analysis for the Variables under Study

The following section presents the results of regression analysis carried out among study variables under the following headings:

- 3.1: Regression analysis between Turnover Intentions and Problem Solving capability.
- 3.2: Regression analysis between Turnover Intentions and Collaborative decision making.
- 3.3: Regression analysis between Turnover Intentions and Morale & Commitment.
- 3.4: Regression analysis between Turnover Intentions and Goal optimization.

The results of regression analysis of above headings are presented below.

#### 3.1 Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Problem Solving capability.

Following is the result of regression analysis carried out between turnover intentions and perceived problem solving capability. The analysis was carried out to see how a dependent variable problem solving capability changes when an independent variable, turnover intention varies.

**Table 3.1.1 Model Summary for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Problem Solving capability**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.714 <sup>a</sup>	0.510	0.509	0.6741

a. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

*Source: Primary data*

**Table 3.1.2 : ANOVA<sup>a</sup> for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Problem Solving capability**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	448.246	1	448.246	986.535	0.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	430.737	598	0.454		
Total	878.983	599			

*Source: Primary data*

**Table 3.1.3: Co-efficients table for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Problem Solving capability**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. err	Beta		
(Constant)	4.522	0.057		79.397	0.000
Turnover Intentions	-0.593	0.019	-0.714	-31.409	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Problem Solving capability.

b. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

$$\text{Regression Equation: } Y = 4.522 - (0.593) X$$

R square value (see **Table 3.1.1**) indicates how much a change in one variable is explained by the change in another variable. It is evident from **Table 3.1.1** that R-square value is 0.510 portraying 51.0 % explanatory power of the model.

The regression model's goodness of fit is analyzed via F-Statistic(**Table: 3.1.2**) F value is 986.535 with 0.000 level of significance. The values indicate regression model is a good fit.

From **Table 3.1.3** the unstandardised coefficient, B value is equal to(-0.593), this means that each unit of increase in turnover intentions results in decrease in problem solving capability by about 0.593 units.

### **3.2 Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Collaborative decision making**

Following is the result of regression analysis carried out between turnover intentions and Collaborative decision making. The analysis was carried out to see how a dependent variable, Collaborative decision making changes when an independent variable, turnover intention varies.

**Table 3.2.1: Model Summary for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Collaborative decision making**

<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Standard Error</b>
1	0.687 <sup>a</sup>	0.473	0.472	0.6263

a. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

*Source: Primary data*

**Table 3.2.2: ANOVA<sup>a</sup> for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Collaborative decision making**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Regression	333.266	1	333.266	849.642	0.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	371.846	598	0.392		
Total	705.113	599			

*Source: Primary data*

**Table 3.2.3: Co-efficients Table for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Collaborative decision making**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Unstandardized Coefficients</b>		<b>Standardized Coefficients</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. err</b>	<b>Beta</b>		
<b>(Constant)</b>	4.356	0.053	-0.687	82.312	0.000
<b>Turnover Intentions</b>	-0.511	0.018		-29.149	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Collaborative decision making

b. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

*Source: Primary data*

**Regression Equation:  $Y = 4.356 - (0.511) X$**

R square value (see **Table 3.2.1**) indicates how much a change in one variable is explained by the change in another variable. It is evident from **Table 3.2.1** that R-square value is 0.473 portraying 47 % explanatory power of the model.

The regression model's goodness of fit is analyzed via F-Statistic, the output (See **Table: 3.2.2**) shows the value of 'F' as 849.642 with a level of significance (0.000) for the calculated F. This value being less than the critical value (0.05) indicates that regression model is a good fit.

From **Table 3.2.3** the unstandardised coefficient, B value is equal to (-0.511), this means for each unit of increase in turnover intentions results in decrease of Collaborative decision making by about 0.511 units.

**3.3 Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Morale & Commitment**

Following is the result of regression analysis carried out between turnover intentions and Morale & Commitment. The analysis was carried out to see how a dependent variable, morale & commitment changes when an independent variable, turnover intention varies.

**Table 3.3.1: Model Summary for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Morale & Commitment**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Standard Error
1	0.672 <sup>a</sup>	0.452	0.451	0.5941

a. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

Source: Primary data

**Table 3.3.2: ANOVA<sup>a</sup> for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Morale & Commitment**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	275.923	1	467.785	1046.228	0.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	334.584	598	0.447		
Total	610.507	599			

Source: Primary data

**Table 3.3.3: Co-efficients table for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Morale & Commitment**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std.err	Beta		
(Constant)	4.306	0.050	-0.672	85.778	0.000
Turnover Intentions	-0.465	0.017		-27.961	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Morale & commitment.

b. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

Source: Primary data

**Regression Equation:  $Y = 4.306 - (0.465) X$**

R square value (see **Table 3.3.1**) indicates how much a change in one variable is explained by the change in another variable. It is evident from **Table 3.3.1** that R-square value is 0.452 portraying 45 % explanatory power of the model.

The regression model's goodness of fit is analyzed via F-Statistic, the output (See **Table 3.3.2**) shows the value of 'F' as 781.793 with a level of significance (0.000) for the calculated F. This value being less than the critical value (0.05), concludes that regression model is a good fit.

From **Table 3.3.3** the unstandardised coefficient, B value is equal to(-0.465), this means for each unit of increase in turnover intentions leads to decrease in morale & commitment by about 0.465 units.

### 3.4 Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Goal optimization

Following is the result of regression analysis carried out between turnover intentions and organizational effectiveness dimension, Goal optimization. The analysis was carried out to see how a dependent variable Goal optimization changes when an independent variable, turnover intention varies.

**Table 3.4.1: Model Summary for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Goal optimization**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Standard Error
1	0.724 <sup>a</sup>	0.525	0.524	0.6687

a. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

*Source: Primary data*

**Table 3.4.2: ANOVA<sup>a</sup> for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Goal optimization**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	467.785	1	467.785	958.138	0.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	423.866	598	0.447		
Total	891.651	599			

*Source: Primary data*

**Table 3.4.3: Co-efficients table for Regression Analysis between Turnover Intentions and Goal optimization**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. err	Beta		
(Constant)	4.597	0.056		81.366	0.000
Turnover Intentions	-0.606	0.019	-0.724	-32.345	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Goal optimization.

b. Predictor: Turnover Intentions

*Source: Primary data*

$$\text{Regression Equation: } Y = 4.597 - (0.606) X$$

R square value (see **Table 3.4.1**) indicates how much a change in one variable is explained by the change in another variable. It is evident from **Table 3.4.1** that R-square value is 0.525 portraying 52 % explanatory power of the model.

The regression model's goodness of fit is analyzed via F-Statistic, the output (See **Table 3.4.2**) shows the value of 'F' as 1046.228 with a level of significance (0.000) for the calculated F. This value being less than the critical value (0.05), indicates that regression model is a good fit.

From **Table 3.4.3** the unstandardised coefficient, B value is equal to (-0.606), this means for each unit of increase in turnover intentions leads to decrease in quality of services by about 0.606 units.

### 3.5 Summarised Results of Regression Analysis

**Table 3.5** shows the summarised results of regression analysis.

**Table: 3.5 Summarised Results of Regression Analysis**

S l. No.	Variable	R Square	F value	P value	Unstd. Coeff. B	P value	Regression Equation	Inference
1	Turnover Intentions (X) Vs Problem Solving Capability (Y)	0.510	986.535	0.000	-0.593	0.000	$Y = 4.522 - (0.593) X$	Negative Impact
2	Turnover Intentions (X) Vs Collaborative decision making (Y)	0.473	849.642	0.000	-0.511	0.000	$Y = 4.356 - (0.511) X$	Negative Impact
3	Turnover Intentions (X) Vs Morale & Commitment (Y)	0.452	1046.23	0.000	-0.465	0.000	$Y = 4.306 - (0.465) X$	Negative Impact
4	Turnover Intentions (X) Vs Goal Optimization (Y)	0.525	958.138	0.000	-0.606	0.000	$Y = 4.597 - (0.606) X$	Negative Impact

*Source: Primary data*

From the above analysis it is clear that all null hypotheses  $H_{01}$  through  $H_{04}$  are rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that turnover intentions impact organizational effectiveness dimensions.

**Findings:**

1. There is a significant relation between turnover intentions and problem solving capability of the organizations ( -0.714). This indicates that if the members are intending to quit the organization, it is likely that problem solving capability of the organization reduces.
2. There seems to be a significant relation between turnover intentions and collaborative decision making (-0.687), revealing that if the employees are intending to quit the organization, it is likely that there will be detrimental effect on collaborative decision making.
3. Turnover intentions and morale & commitment are negatively and strongly correlated with each other ( $r = -0.672$ ). this indicates that if the members are intending to quit the organization, it is likely that morale & commitment drops.
4. There is a significant relationship between Turnover intentions and goal optimization (-0.724) this indicates that that if the members are intending to quit the organization, it is likely that member's goal optimization drops.
5. The results of regression analysis between turnover intentions and problem solving capability estimates a B value (unstandardized coefficient) (-0.593) and the p-value (=0.000) which is less than 0.05. Thus the study clarifies that turnover intentions negatively impact problem solving capability of the organization.
6. The regression analysis between turnover intentions and collaborative decision making identifies B value as (-0.511) and the p-Value (=0.000) which is less than 0.05 at 5 per cent level of significance. Thus study clarifies that turnover intentions influence collaborative decision making in a negative way.
7. Regression analysis between turnover intentions and morale & commitment reveals B value (-0.465) and the p-value (0.000). This p-value is less than the critical value (0.05) clarifies that turnover intent influences morale & commitment in a negative way.
8. Regression analysis between turnover intentions and goal optimization reveals B value (-0.606) and the p-value (=0.000). This p-value is less than the critical value (0.05) clarifies that turnover intent influences member's goal optimization in a reverse direction.

**Recommendations:**

1. The study reveals that turnover intentions of employees negatively influence the problem solving capability of employees, therefore human resource practitioners should reduce turnover intentions in order to be effective in terms of problem solving.
2. It is clear from the study that there exists a negative association between collaborative decision making and turnover intent. Therefore organizations looking for better decisions monitor and correct the turnover intentions.
3. Study puts forth that turnover intentions negatively impact morale and commitment of employees, hence practitioners should try and lessen turnover intentions to enhance morale and commitment among employees.

4. It was found that there is a strong and negative correlation between goal optimization and turnover intentions. Therefore, functional managers should weed out negative perceptions among employees there by reducing the intentions to quit for better goal optimization by the members..
5. Study reveals that turnover intentions negatively impact organizational effectiveness and are clear indices of it. Therefore, organizations should concentrate on practices to improve organizational factors impacting turnover intentions so as to enhance their effectiveness.

#### **References:**

1. Abassi SM, Hollman KW (2000), "Turnover: The Real Bottom Line", *Public Personnel Management*, 2(3), 333–342.  
doi: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279868446\\_Turnover\\_The\\_real\\_bottom\\_line](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279868446_Turnover_The_real_bottom_line)
2. Campbell, J. P. (1977). "On the Nature of Organizational Effectiveness", In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.  
doi: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002188638001600408>
3. Chen, Y. C., Kuo, C., Cheng, W. W., Hsai, H., Chien, C. Y. (2010), "Structural Investigation of the Relationship between Working Satisfaction and Employee Turnover", *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 6 (1), 41 – 50.  
doi: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815052416>
4. Cummings, L. L. (1977), "Emergence of the Instrumental Organization", In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, San Francisco, Calif., Jossey-Bass.
5. Fang, Tony & Verma, A. (2002), "Union Wage Premium", *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, Ottawa, 14 (4), 17 – 23.
6. Frank, F. D., Finnegan, R. P. & Taylor, C.R. (2004), "The Race for Talent: Retaining and Engaging Workers in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century", *Human Resource Planning*, 27 (3), 12 – 25.  
doi: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.514.4132&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
7. Hom P. W., & Griffeth R. W. (1995), "Employee Turnover", *South Western College Publishing*, Cincinnati.
8. Iqbal, A. (2010), "An Empirical Assessment of Demographic Factors, Organizational Ranks and Organizational Commitment", *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (3), 16 – 27.  
doi: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41891808\\_An\\_Empirical\\_Assessment\\_of\\_Demographic\\_Factors\\_Organizational\\_Ranks\\_and\\_Organizational\\_Commitment](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41891808_An_Empirical_Assessment_of_Demographic_Factors_Organizational_Ranks_and_Organizational_Commitment)
9. Meaghan Stovel, Nick Bontis (2002), "Voluntary Turnover: Knowledge Management-Friend or Foe?", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 3 (3), 303 – 322.

doi:

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1856/1de816a436871587869169369dfe086ecb6c.pdf>

10. Mowday, R., Steers, R. and Porter, L. (1979), "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224 – 247.

doi:

[https://www.academia.edu/3379532/The\\_measurement\\_of\\_organizational\\_commitment\\_1](https://www.academia.edu/3379532/The_measurement_of_organizational_commitment_1)

11. Shore, L. M. F., & Martin, H. J. (1989), "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Relation to Work Performance and Turnover Intentions", *Human Relations*, 42 (7), 625 – 638.

doi: [https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/busman\\_lab\\_facpub/10/](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/busman_lab_facpub/10/)

12. Schwepker, C. H. (2001), "Ethical Climate's Relationship to Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention in the Salesforce", *Journal of Business Research*, 54 (1), 39 – 52.

13. Wright, T.A. and Bonett, D. G. (2007), "Job Satisfaction and Psychological Well-being".

doi: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0149206306297582>