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Abstract

Why employees leave their organizations or companies has been a topic of interest to both researchers and managers. There is no doubt that turnover is costly; thus, it is important to understand what leads to such a phenomenon. Is it job satisfaction? Is it the lack of organizational commitment? Is it the lack of training? Is it the employees’ perceived support of both the supervisor/manager and the organization as a whole? Is it organizational climate? Is it organizational justice? This conceptual paper sheds some light on the relevant literature and identifies the antecedents of employees’ turnover. The paper proposes a theoretical framework that shows the variables that explain the phenomenon of turnover intention.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Turnover Intention

Retention and staff turnover are two important issues that affect organizations in several ways. In this context, it is important to cite Andrew Carnegie, the famous industrialist of the 19th century, who mentioned: “Take away my factories, my plants; take away my railroads, my ships, my transportation, take away my money; strip me of all of these but leave me my key employees, and in two or three years, I will have them all again” (Gupta & Srivastava, 2007). Moreover, the research of Ahlrichs (2000) highlighted the most underestimated costs of turnover of key employees for employers. There are two kinds of costs for turnover, which are visible and invisible costs.

Visible turnover costs include leave capitalization, recruitment costs, reference checks, security clearance, temporary worker costs, relocation costs, formal training costs and induction expenses. Invisible costs involve enlarged HR and payroll administration, loss of productivity, and informal training. Other hidden costs comprise missed deadlines, loss of organizational knowledge, low motivation as a result of overwork, loss of clients and chain reaction turnover. Another turnover consequence for the organization is its impact on employee-customer relationships. Normally, long-tenured employees develop personal relationships with customers. These relationships are the basis for a re-enforcing cycle of beneficial interactions between employees and customers. Staff retention thus has a positive effect on good customer relationship and ultimately profitability (Rust, Stewart, Miller, & Pielack, 1996).

Another result of staff turnover is on those who remain with the company. Losing good employees is also costly in terms of the impact it has on company morale. Those that remain may often feel demotivated or disheartened, ensuing in a reduction in productivity and job satisfaction. If other employees observe the new job opportunities being grasped by their colleagues, they could also follow suit. These latter costs, although more difficult to calculate, are also harmful (Hay, 2002).

This paper aims at proposing a conceptual framework that highlights the main antecedents of turnover intention as highlighted in the literature.

There are a number of reasons why turnover takes place. These reasons may range from external environmental variables such as economy that affects the business that in turn shapes the employment levels (Mobley, 1982; Pettman, 1975; Schervish, 1983; Terborg & Lee, 1984) to organizational factors including types of industry, types of occupation, size of organization, payment, supervisory levels, locations, selection processes, work
environment, work assignments, benefits, and promotions (Arthur & Rousseau, 2001; Mobley, 1982).

The other variables that affect employee turnover in organizations involve the individual’s work variables such as demographic variables, integrative variables like job satisfaction, pay, promotion and working condition (Arthur, 2001; Mobley, 1982; Pettman, 1975) and the individual’s non-working factors such as family related factors (Mobley, 1982; Pettman, 1975).

In addition, demographic variables cannot be disregarded. Age, tenure, level of education, level of income, job category, and gender have been proven to affect employee retention and have been discovered to have established relationship with turnover intention. Among the above demographic factors, age, tenure and income level were discovered to be negatively associated with turnover intention (Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Gerhart, 1990; Price & Mueller, 1986; Tai & Robinson, 1998; Weil & Kimball, 1995), level of education is positively related to turnover as employees with higher education levels have higher tendency to quit (Berg, 1991; Cotton & Tuttle, 1996). With regard to job category, Tai and Robinson (1998) and Price and Mueller (1986) found that non-managerial employees have higher tendency to quit than managerial employees.

Some HRM practices have been recommended as potential answers for turnover problem, such as investment in training, providing organizational support, implementing innovative recruitment and selection processes, providing better career opportunities (Cheng & Brown, 1998; Forrier & Sels, 2003; Hinkin & Tracey, 2000; Walsh & Taylor, 2007; Walters & Raybould, 2007) and implementing effective strategies to improve job satisfaction and commitment (Aksu, 2004).

Employee turnover is not only a significant tangible cost but also an intangible or “hidden” cost associated with loss of skills, inefficiency and replacement costs (Lashley & Chaplain, 1999). Lashley (2000) mentioned that loss of investment in training and loss of staff expertise are examples of turnover costs and opportunity costs. Some authors highlighted more intangible costs of turnover associated with organizational behavior and related “hygiene factors”, for example, work reutilization, role conflict, reduced job satisfaction, low morale, reduced commitment, destructive supervision/leadership and a lack of career growth that influence employee productivity, effectiveness, quality and hotel service standards (Deery, Iverson, & Ervin, 1994; Davidson, Manning, Brosnan, & Timo, 2001; Davidson, Manning, Brosnan, & Timo, 2001; Davidson, Manning, Timo, & Ryder, 2001; O’Connell & Kung, 2007).

Studies have shown that loss of productivity caused by employee turnover accounts for more than two-thirds of the total turnover costs (Tracey & Hinkin, 2008). As turnover escalates, service quality deteriorates as it takes time to replace departing employees, especially at busy hotels (Lynn, 2002).

Turnover is harmful for various industries. For example, in the hotel industry, a decline in employee turnover would be a significant factor in lowering costs and enhancing labour productivity. However, managing and accounting for turnover remain a difficult challenge for hotels as there is no single point of accountability within or between units. There seems to be a number of effective strategies to achieve better employee turnover rate and the hotel accountability configuration remains comparatively fragile. The HRM budget generally includes direct costs of turnover (Davidson, Guiding, & Timo, 2006). This is most probably because the cost of employee turnover is excluded from the conventional accounting practices within hotels. This practice denotes the loss of accountability and poor internal organizational visibility for this cost. The loss of accountability issue is intensified when it is recognized that the cost originates from a different accountability unit (i.e. the area of the organization where the employee works) to the unit that incurs much of the cost associated with employee turnover (HRM).

1.2 Organizational Commitment

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) defined organizational commitment as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Organizational commitment reflects an individual’s feelings about the organization as a whole. Organizational commitment has become more crucial than ever in comprehending employee behaviour because it is recognized as more consistent and less dependable on daily variation compared to job satisfaction (Angle & Perry, 1983; Mowday, et al., 1982). Organizational commitment can be broadly defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, an organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). As an antecedent, it is understood that committed employees are unlikely to leave the organization, as well as feel the need to go beyond normal job requirements. Committed employees are also willing to make a more significant and personal contribution to the organization, perform
better, engage in organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) and are unlikely to engage in unproductive or destructive behaviours (Iqbal, Aziz, & Tasawar, 2012; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Meyer, et al., 2002). As an outcome, organizational commitment has been discovered to arise from positive work experiences, job satisfaction, trust in management, and attractive remuneration and rewards (Meyer, et al., 2002).

Studies in this area have reported a strong relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, signifying that higher levels of commitment will result in lower levels of intention to leave, therefore lower turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Bentein, Vandenberghe, Vandenberg, Stinglhamber, 2005; Falkenburg & Schyns, 2007; Good, Page, & Young, 1996; Harris & Cameron, 2005; Huselid, 1995; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Organizational commitment is one of the predictors of turnover intention (Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986). Qi (2007) found that affective commitment has a significant negative influence on turnover intention, which is similar to a research done by Law (2005), which showed that affective commitment is the most important component of commitment in predicting employees’ turnover.

1.3 Job Satisfaction

Many studies have indicated that job satisfaction serves as an antecedent to turnover intention. For example, Ali (2008) highlighted that problems might arise if employees’ dissatisfaction are not taken into consideration. Employees who are dissatisfied would sooner or later leave the organization, and at the same time, the organization loses the knowledge that the employees had brought in. If the organization decided to employ new employees to replace those who leave, and their feelings of dissatisfaction are not met, this could affect the daily operation of the organization, and the vicious cycle of turnover will occur. In addition, Hay (2002) discovered that the majority of the employees chose career opportunities, and learning and development as the foremost reasons to stay in an organization, which lead to job satisfaction.

Career satisfaction and career success are interchangeably used in this study. Career success is defined as positive psychological or work-related outcomes or achievements that a person gathers as the outcome of work experiences (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999). Models of career success have incorporated a number of demographic, human capital, and motivational variables related to career success (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr, 1994; Judge, et al., 1999). Previously, much research on careers have viewed the individual as being passive and influenced by situational factors (Bell & Staw, 1989). Career/job satisfaction is a significant predictor of employee turnover (Egan, Yang, & Bartlett, 2004; Wright & Bonett, 2007). Employees most probably leave their organization when both their psychological well-being and job satisfaction are low (Wright & Bonett, 2007). Satisfaction with meaningful work and promotion opportunities were significant predictors of turnover intention (Wright & Bonett, 1992).

Previous studies have discovered that job dissatisfaction is associated with negative behavioural outcomes such as absenteeism, workplace accidents, and labour turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Newstrom, 2007; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2007). Currall, Towler, Judge, and Kohn (2005) discovered that pay satisfaction is positively related to performance and negatively related to employee turnover intention. Similarly, the outcome of another study by Davis (2006) also showed that general job satisfaction is strongly and negatively associated with turnover intention. Job satisfaction has been empirically proven to be the main predictor of turnover intention (Larrabee, Janney, Ostrow, Withrow, Hobbs, & Burant, 2003; Parry, 2008).

1.4 Training

Some scholars have agreed that there is a positive connection between the staff turnover rate and the scale of investment in training in two ways (Green, Machin, & Wilkinson, 1996). The first interpretation contends that organizations with high turnover will invest more in training so as to replace the skills and competencies of the outgoing personnel (replacement investments) and/or to increase employment loyalty in the future (retention management). The second interpretation claims that organizations train extensively thereby generating higher turnover precisely because the trained employees leave the organization for better paid jobs where they can use the skills they have acquired. Training increases the value of the employees, and this increases the probability of being picked by rival organizations.

Some groups of scholars in the field of economics claim a negative relationship between turnover and training. It is influenced by Becker’s Human Capital Theory. Becker (2009) asserted that the investment in training is the outcome of optimising decisions agreed by both workers and employers. The improved skills resulting from general training enable workers to extract higher wages from their current or future employers. Since employers are confronted with the risk of not being able to recover this investment, they will not be willing to support general training of their workers. Firm-specific training, on the other hand, cannot generate an increased wage with other than the current employers. Therefore, firms can recover their investment in specific training and they
will be willing to share some or all of the costs of specific training. According to Becker (2009), a purely competitive labour market will always provide the optimal level of training investment.

1.5 Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) reflects the overall belief of employees that their organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). The concepts of social exchange and the norm of reciprocity are often used by researchers to describe the motivation for employees to display positive behaviours towards their organization, such as loyalty, which are not formally rewarded or contractually required by the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996).

However, the relationship between POS and turnover intention appears to clarify options for managers to take positive steps to retain valuable employees. Loi, Hang-Yue, and Foley (2006) have put an effort to measure the mediating role of POS on the relationship between perceived justice, predicting organizational commitment and intention to leave, while controlling for the effects of the size of the firm and demographic variables. They found that POS mediated the relationship between organizational justice (procedural and distributive) and both organizational commitment and intention to leave. Although the association between organizational commitment and turnover intention has been well established, research into the relationship between POS and turnover intention has only been given serious attention recently (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003).

Eisenberger et al. (1986) proposed that in order to assess the willingness of the organization to reward employees’ efforts, they generate perceptions as to the extent to which the organization cares about their well-being and values their contribution, which they label as perceived organizational support (POS).

The provision of organizational support to an employee is likely to create feelings of goodwill towards the organization, strengthening the bond between employer and employee, which, in turn, increases the feelings of obligation to repay the organization, through the norm of reciprocity (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2007).

As a result, POS should be positively related to affective organizational commitment and negatively related to turnover intentions. Recent studies confirm these relationships empirically in the Western settings (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Maertz et al., 2007).

1.6 Perceived Supervisor Support

A review of existing studies suggests that when employees develop general views concerning the degree to which their supervisors care about their well-being and value their contributions towards the organization, it is called Perceived Supervisor Support or PSS (Maertz et al., 2007). PSS has received increasing attention in the literature and has been discovered to be significantly related to important organizational outcomes including employee turnover and turnover intentions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Maertz et al., 2007).

Studies were primarily conducted in the Western settings and the findings confirm the existence of a strong positive relationship between perceived work-related support and organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment, turnover intentions and turnover behaviour (Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Existing studies have reported significant positive relationship between PSS and POS (Yoon & Lim, 1999; Yoon & Thye, 2000; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). However, there is an argument in the literature about the link between PSS and POS.

A group of scholars suggest that the influence of PSS on organizational outcomes, such as affective commitment and employee turnover intentions, is fully mediated by POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) discovered that POS fully mediate the relationship between PSS and turnover. Rhoades et al. (2001) supported their view by highlighting that the influence of PSS on affective commitment was fully mediated through PSS. Another group of scholars suggest that supervisor level constructs such as PSS might have direct as well as indirect influences on organizational outcomes such as turnover intentions (Becker, 2009; Maertz et al., 2007; Maertz, Mosley, & Alford, 2002).

The relationship between POS and a number of outcome variables has been established and particular attention has been given to POS in the context of employee turnover. Indeed, many supportive organizational practices are specifically intended to increase the connection between employee and employer in order to reduce voluntary turnover. Participation in decision-making, fairness of rewards (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003), developmental experiences and promotions (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), autonomy (Aubé, Rousseau, & Morin, 2007), and
job security (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) have been empirically associated with POS. These actions reflect the organization’s inclination to meet employees’ socio-emotional needs (Eisenberger et al., 1986). POS ensures employees that the organization stands behind them as they perform their jobs and cope with stressful situations (George, Reed, Ballard, Colin, & Fielding, 1993). In agreement with the norm of reciprocity, supported employees tend to value and respect their organization and are therefore willing to contribute to the organization’s goals.

Foong-ming (2008) mentioned that supervisors mainly participated in performance evaluation and feedback. Hence, the supervisors’ favorable or unfavorable action mirrors an organization’s view and decisions on employees. Referring to a study conducted by Gentry, Kuhnert, Mondore, and Page (2006), employees who are given a voice, open communication, recognition, supported by their respective supervisors, and have their well-being cared for, are inclined to stay with the organization for a long period of time.

1.7 Organizational Climate

Most of the employees remain with the organization if they receive motivating tools such as bonuses but yet remuneration is not the only thing that can motivate employees to remain with the organization (Anderfuhren-Biget, Varone, Giauque, & Ritz, 2010; Masaiti & Naluyele, 2011). The biggest factor in attracting and most importantly retaining key employee is culture. It is important for employees to feel like they are part of a team, they require a link to the vision and direction of the organization and their co-employees, and they require ways of working better together, which ultimately lead to more cooperation.

Recent research (Schyns, van Veldhoven, & Wood, 2009; Rashid, Wineman, & Zimring, 2009; Khan, Hassan, Anwar, Babar, Babar, & Khan, 2007) established that discouraging organizational climate negatively affects job satisfaction which in turn may expedite employee turnover.

Moran and Volkwein (1992), for example, defined corporate climate as a relatively stable characteristic of an organization which differentiate it from other organizations and: (a) represents members’ shared perceptions about their organization with respect to dimensions such as autonomy, cohesiveness, support, recognition, innovation, and fairness; b) is generated from members’ interaction; (c) acts as a basis for interpreting the situation; (d) manifests the prevalent norms, values, and attitudes of organizational cultures; and (e) serves as a source of power for forming behaviour.

Lambert, Hogan, and Barton (2001) highlighted five variables of work environment, namely; role conflict, task variety, financial rewards, relations with co-workers and autonomy/participants. Moreover, Downey, Don, and Slocum (1975) recommended six components of organizational climate; decision making, warmth, risk, openness, reward and structure. Altmann (2000) proposed that corporate climate can be classified into the following dimensions; job, role, leaders, organization and workgroup.

Employees are more likely to leave if they perceive a lack of clear direction from the management. It seems that companies are less proficient at marketing themselves to their employees than they are at selling the company to other stakeholders (Hay, 2002).

Stone, Larson, Mooney-Kane, Smolowitz, Lin, and Dick (2006) established that there is a link between organizational climate and intention to leave. Thatcher, Stepnia, and Boyle (2003) confirmed the effect of organizational climate on the turnover intention in an information technology firm. They discovered a strong relationship between them.

1.8 Employee Benefits and Opportunities

Research has established that financial reward is one of the basic types of extrinsic monetary rewards which comprise the basic needs of income to survive (to pay bills), a feeling of stability and consistency (the job is secure), and recognition (my workplace values my skills) (Aguenza & Som, 2012).

Higginbotham (1997) mentioned that high salaries are not important, but “good” and “fair” salaries indicate a strong correlation with intention to remain, signifying that as long as the compensation is competitive, financial rewards are not the primary factor in retention. Kochanski and Ledford (2001) supported this testimonial, which signify that the actual level of pay is less important than feelings about pay raises and the process used to manage them.

Previous studies investigated how family-friendly practices and work-life balance practices were associated with employee retention (Grover & Crooker, 1995) and summarized that childbirth and child-rearing are left with the promise of full-time re-employment and retention can be promoted by disseminating information about local childcare services. Many intermediary factors, e.g. job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation, trust
(in the organization), and other job attitude factors, have been accepted with proven effects. In investigating the link between employee benefit programs and retention, another model was examined with regard to the effect of monetary worth (an objective factor) of employee stock options programs and the feeling of participating in company management through this (a subjective factor), which may lead to withdrawal intention and actual spontaneous resignation by way of multi-step awareness, i.e. satisfaction with the system, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Buchko, 1993). In summary, this model clarify that both the objective and subjective factors are related to retention, and that job satisfaction is important as an intermediary factor.

Gustafson (2002) established in her study that compensation and opportunities for better pay largely lead to employees’ turnover intention in organizations. An important theory used as reference in this study is equity theory developed by Adams (1965) that explained that individuals, who value fair treatment, will strive to keep the relationships between members within an organization. And so, if the employees feel that inequality exists in pay treatment, a range of negative behaviors will be present such as absenteeism, and the desire to leave the organization.

1.9 Organizational Justice

Organizational justice was first applied by Greenberg in the 1970s (Greenberg, 1987). The author described organizational justice as a fair and equitable behavior of the organizations towards their employees (Rafei-Dehkordi Mohammadi & Yektayar, 2013).

In order to ensure that employees are satisfied, committed, and loyal, the organization needs to be fair in its systems regarding distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organization in every aspect, they are likely to show more positive attitude and behaviors such as job satisfaction (Karimi, Alipour, Pour, & Azizi, 2013) and commitment (Malik & Naeem, 2011).

A lot of studies have empirically proven that job satisfaction is related to higher levels of organizational justice (Dundar & Tabancali, 2012; Nojani, Arjmandnia, Afroz, & Rajabi, 2012; Taheri & Soltani, 2013). Organizational justice can be described as a blend of fairness in procedures used by leaders to decide on outcome distributions or allocations, and the fairness of outcome distributions or allocations (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001).

Organizational justice has been empirically proven to be strongly associated with many dynamics related to change, such as openness to change, acceptance of change, cooperation with change, satisfaction with change (Blader & Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Blader, 2003; Wanberg & Banas, 2000) and individual response to change (Greenberg, 2001). In addition, it has been also considered as an antecedent of commitment to change (Foster, 2010; Kool & van Dierendonck, 2012; Paolillo, Platania, Magnano, & Ramaci, 2015). Intention to leave and later turnover action are an essential part of change that managers must be aware of.

Justice is a concept that encompasses many dimensions, which include a range of questions, from compensation that employees get to behavioral treatment towards employees by their superior. The function of fairness related to the place of work is referred to as organizational justice; it includes the ways that decide the fair treatment of employees during the performance of their jobs and as a result this influences employees’ behavior at work (Moorman, 1991).

Likewise, Matin, Jandaghi, and Ahmadi (2010) categorized the types of justice as follows; distributive justice is the type of organizational justice that emphasizes on the perceptions of the people that the amount they received fairly reflects the outcomes of the value added work. Procedural justice manifests people’s beliefs of the fairness of the procedures that determine the outcomes they have. Unfair procedures will lead to the rejection of the entire system (Al-Salemi, 2013; Matin et al., 2010).

Although the organizational justice is a comprehensive term that describes the employees’ perceptions of fairness in an organization as a whole, psychologists and social experts classify them into three components; distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (Dessler, 2005).

Distributive justice concerns people’s beliefs that they have received a fair amount of valued work-related outcomes (e.g., pay, recognition, etc.) (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). Distributive justice was discovered to be linked to work outcomes such as pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust in organization (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Procedural justice reflects the fairness of the decision process that lead to a particular outcome (Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). Studies have shown that people are likely to accept an unfavorable outcome if they believe that the decision process leading up to it was performed according to organizational justice principles (e.g., consistency, neutrality, accuracy, correctability, etc.) (Baldwin, 2006).
Organizational justice is a general term used to reflect individuals’ perceptions of fairness within organizations and the effect of those perceptions on behavior (Adams, 1965; Clayton & Opotow, 2003; Colquitt et al., 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Tyler & Blader, 2003). It can also be described as the employees’ perception on the fairness and sincerity of treatment they received (Elovainio, van den Bos, Linna, Kivimäki, Ala-Mursula, Pentti, & Vahtera, 2005) and the fairness of the process and results obtained at the workplace (Hubbel & Chory-Assad, 2005).

A review of existing studies indicates the existence of multiple facets of organizational justice; namely, distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Konovsky, 2000; Greenberg, 1990). Distributive justice primarily relates to the employee perception about the fairness of outcomes (Greenberg, 1987; 1990) such as financial rewards received from their organization (Greenberg, 2006; Colquitt, Scott, Judge, & Shaw, 2006; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004; Elovainio, Kivimäki, Steen, & Vahtera, 2004; Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002).

Procedural justice primarily concerns the processes and methods through which outcome decision is reached (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Ding & Lin, 2006; Greenberg, 1990). It is the employees’ perception about fairness in the rules and regulations which serve as a basis to make a decision that subsequently lead to the ultimate outcome (Aryee et al., 2002; Byrne, 2005; DeConinck & Bachmann, 2005; Ding & Lin, 2006; Elovainio et al., 2004; Greenberg, 2001).

Interactional justice is regarded as the main concern in workplace settings because of its relationship with unfair and fair treatment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Martínez-Tur et al., 2006). Later, studies have established the two subcategories of interactional justice known as interpersonal and informational justice and should be considered as separate (Colquitt, 2001). Greenberg (1990) recommended two specific types of interpersonal treatment; (1) informational justice which mainly emphasizes on why the specific outcome of an activity emerges in a certain fashion, and (2) interpersonal justice which concerns how employees are treated with dignity, politeness and respect by others.

Based on the discussion, the following are the research propositions:

P1: Employees’ organizational commitment (affective, normative and continuance commitment) reduces employees’ turnover intention.

P2: Employees’ job satisfaction reduces employees’ turnover intention.

P3: Training reduces employees’ turnover intention.

P4: Perceived organizational support reduces employees’ turnover intention.

P5: Perceived supervisor support reduces employees’ turnover intention.

P6: Organizational climate reduces employees’ turnover intention.

P7: Employees’ benefits and opportunities reduce employees’ turnover intention.

P8: Organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) reduces employees’ turnover intention.

2. Conclusion

2.1 Managerial Implication

Employees’ turnover has become a critical issue in today’s organizations. The rate of employee turnover has been increasing from time to time due to a lot of factors. This review of previous studies is intended to consolidate previous research findings in order to establish a cohesive framework of employee turnover so that organizations are aware of the factors that might lead to turnover. Based on the review, seven common factors are found to be related to turnover; namely, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, training, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, organizational climate, employees’ benefits and opportunities and organizational justice. These factors have to be taken care of by the organizations to ensure that they can retain their employees especially those that can contribute significantly to the well-being of the organizations. Employee-organization link is considered as a reciprocal relationship. If the employees feel that they are taken care of by the organization, they will repay in terms of their loyalty to the organization.

2.2 Suggestions for Future Research

This paper is meant to establish a framework of employee turnover based on the findings of the previous research works. The proposed relationships have to be empirically tested to examine whether they remain as significant predictors of turnover or otherwise, regardless of the contexts of the study. Some factors might
remain as predictors and others might act as mediators or moderators for the main relationship, therefore, this relationship must be rigorously tested using the appropriate analyses. Besides, due to the abundance of research instruments available to gauge the levels of employees’ turnover and its predictors, future researchers must take precautionary measures to choose the one that is most valid and reliable. In most instances, the influence of extraneous factors is inevitable, therefore, the use of control variables are advisable to ensure that the results are truly reflective of the influence of the main factors that affect the phenomenon of interest. The control variables can be the demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, tenure, job position and others. They can also be in the form of organizational variables such as types of organizations or nature of business.
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